

ED 024 118

EA 001 723

By- McCarrey, Leon R.; Kolber, Lawrence B.

The Importance of Coordination in Higher Education.

Utah State Coordinating Council of Higher Education, Salt Lake City.

Pub Date Apr 68

Note- 136p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.75 HC-\$6.90

Descriptors- Administrative Organization, *Educational Coordination, Educational Responsibility, *Higher Education, Instructional Programs, Post Secondary Education, *Program Development, *State Agencies, *State Surveys

Identifiers- Utah

This document illustrates several ways by which program allocation can facilitate development of quality educational programs in Utah. A major portion of the document is devoted to a State-by-State analysis of the single boards and councils of higher education in 21 States. These investigations are concerned with the structure, authority, responsibility, and institutional guidelines for the approval of new programs. The need for a central State coordinating agency for the State of Utah is then determined, and an attempt is made to develop specific criteria and guidelines for the evaluation of instructional programs and administrative units. Since Utah is lagging behind a number of States in developing an integrated Statewide educational program, it is suggested that this proposed agency should be empowered, via appropriate legislation, to review and allocate programs for Utah's institutions of higher education. (HW)

EDO 24118

THE IMPORTANCE

of...

COORDINATION

in

HIGHER EDUCATION

Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education

April 1968

EA 001 723

UTAH COORDINATING COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Members of the Council:

Peter W. Billings, Chairman
David Lawrence McKay
Daniel L. Berman
Warren H. Bulloch
George C. Hatch

Charles E. Peterson
Mrs. David K. Watkiss
D. Jay Wilson
Conley Watts

Liaison Members of the Council:

(Institutional Representatives & Ex-Officio Member)

Wayne H. Burt
Phillip A. Bullen
Mrs. Blaine Peterson
L. Leon Jennings
Edmund J. Flynn

University of Utah
Utah State University
Weber State College
State Board of Education
College of Southern Utah

Speaker Franklin W. Gunnell

State Legislature

Members of the Council Staff:

Merle E. Allen, Director
S. Bertell Bunker, Associate Director - Finance
R. Kent Fielding, Associate Director - Planning
Leon R. McCarrey, Associate Director - Academic Affairs & Research

Address:

1201 University Club Building
136 East South Temple Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.**

**THE IMPORTANCE OF COORDINATION
IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Prepared by:

**Leon R. McCarrey
and
Lawrence B. Kolber**

**Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education
1201 University Club Building
Salt Lake City, Utah**

April 1968

PREFACE

Most states have recognized the need for a central agency to deal with the coordination, planning, and design of their higher education functions. Thirty-eight states reported such an agency when Nancy M. Berve made a study for the Academy for Educational Development in 1967. Thirteen of these agencies reported that they were responsible for the actual administration of institutions. The rest reported varying degrees of coordinating responsibility and authority.

No central agency can serve adequately until it has made provision to determine a proper role for its institutions.

This study was conducted as a part of Utah's master planning effort by Dr. Leon McCarrey, assisted by Mr. Lawrence Kolber. Objectives and procedures relating to institutional role and division of institutional responsibilities with state plans were reviewed. Cooperation by state agencies in supplying information has been gratifying.

The report provides a sound basis for the redesign and improvement of the plan for coordination in Utah. It is hoped that other states will find such a summary useful in their efforts to evaluate and improve their own programs.

Merle E. Allen
Director
Utah Coordinating Council of
Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF SINGLE BOARDS & COORDINATING COUNCILS IN RELATION TO PROGRAM APPROVAL	7
Colorado	9
Connecticut	12
Florida	14
Georgia	16
Illinois	18
Iowa	23
Kansas	23
Massachusetts	24
Michigan	26
Montana	29
New Jersey	33
New York	35
North Carolina	39
North Dakota	45
Ohio	48
Oklahoma	56
Oregon	59
Rhode Island	67
Texas	68
Virginia	77
Wisconsin	82
III. NEED FOR COORDINATION	87
New Administrative Unit and Program Approval	87
Limits of Authority - Course(s) Approval	89
Limits of Authority - New Program & Administrative Unit Approval	92

	Page
IV. CRITERIA FOR NEW PROGRAMS	95
Introduction	95
Preparation of Document	95
Procedure for Program Evaluation	97
Submission of New Programs in Response to Central Agency Request	98
Criteria for Program Submission	98
Summary	107
APPENDIX	109

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the basic functions of higher education in any state is the satisfying of individual needs for various types of training. In satisfying these needs, it is paramount that higher education relate its programs to the socio-economic manpower needs of the community, state, and nation.

In the achievement of this goal, each institution in Utah has a significant role to play. The roles should vary according to the character of the institution. Utah's system of higher education consists of the universities, the four-year colleges, the junior colleges, and the technical/vocational schools, all contributing within their areas of expertise to the total educational program of the State.

If this total educational program is to function and develop effectively, a coordinated plan of all post-high school curricula is necessary so that Utah can assure the availability of quality educational opportunities for all students. This should be accomplished without unnecessary duplication and a consequent waste of the State's resources.

Legislators, educators, governing boards, and lay citizens have become increasingly aware of the need for some kind of curricular coordination by a central state agency. The general attitude of many is that

coordinated development of higher education programs can be achieved without violating Utah's educational traditions or intruding on the initiative or creativity of its institutions. Democratic traditions in education do not require that all students attend the same or similar institutions, nor do they require the pursuit of similar curricula. Coordination allows for an appropriate division of labor among Utah's institutions, creating a differentiated role for each.

This document has been prepared for the purpose of illustrating the several ways by which program allocation can facilitate development of quality education programs in the State of Utah.

As will be discussed in Chapter II, a number of states are achieving effective coordination by implementing previously passed legislation empowering a central state body to advise, recommend, and allocate curricular offerings. Other states, including Utah, appear to be moving in this direction, although they are currently at a less advanced stage of development.

The current status of the coordination of higher education programs in the United States is presented in the following table:

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCIES
CONCERNED WITH PLANNING BY STATE

State	Is There a Central Planning or Coordinating Agency?		Authority **		No New Program Without Approval**
	None Exists*	There is An Agency*	Advisory	Management	
Alabama	X				
Alaska		X(b)		X	X
Arizona		X(c)		X	X
Arkansas		X	X		
California		X			
Colorado		X	X		X
Connecticut		X	X		X
Delaware	X				
District of Columbia	X				
Florida		X		X	X
Georgia		X		X	X
Hawaii		X(b)			
Idaho		X		X	X
Illinois		X(a)		X	X
Indiana		X(e)		X	X
Iowa (g)		X		X	
Kansas		X		X	
Kentucky				X	
Louisiana	X				
Maine	X				
Maryland		X	X		
Massachusetts		X		X	
Michigan		X	X		X

(see end of Table I for footnotes)

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

State	Is There a Central Planning or Coordinating Agency?		Authority**		No New Program Without Approval**
	None Exists*	There is An Agency*	Advisory	Management	
Minnesota		X	X		
Mississippi		X		X	X
Missouri		X		X	
Montana		X(d)		X	
Nebraska	X				
Nevada		X(b)		X	
New Hampshire (g)		X		X	
New Jersey		X		X	
New York		X		X	X
North Carolina		X		X	X
North Dakota		X		X	X
Ohio		X		X	X
Oklahoma		X(d)		X	X
Oregon		X		X	
Pennsylvania		X		X	
Rhode Island		X		X	
South Carolina		X	X		
South Dakota		X		X	
Tennessee		X(f)			
Texas		X		X	X
Utah		X	X		
Vermont	X				
Virginia		X		X	X
Washington	X				

(see end of Table I for footnotes)

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

State	Is There a Central Planning or Coordinating Agency?			Authority**		No New Program Without Approval**
	None Exists*	There is An Agency*	Advisory	Management		
West Virginia	X					
Wisconsin (g)		X		X		X
Wyoming	X					
(a)	Not applicable					
(b)	Only one public institution of higher education in the state					
(c)	Except for public junior or community colleges, which are under a separate board					
(d)	Except public junior or community colleges, each of which is under a separate governing board					
(e)	An unofficial voluntary agency					
(f)	An agency has been established by the legislature, although no staff or office had been selected as of the date of this report					
(g)	Additional information received by the staff of the Utah State Coordinating Council of Higher Education					

SOURCES: *Nancy M. Berve, "Present Planning for Higher Education," prepared for the National Institute of Health Under Contract Ph-43-66-1166, July, 1967, and **"Legal Basis of Coordinating Boards of Higher Education," prepared for Master Plan Study Committee G, Governance, Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education, November, 1967.

Table I indicates that there are currently 38 central agencies for the coordination of higher education. In terms of authority, 32 agencies have some degree of management authority. Nineteen of these agencies also have authority over new program requests.

OVERVIEW

Chapter II will be devoted to a review of state governing boards and coordinating councils of higher education. In Chapter III, a discussion of the need for coordination of higher education will be presented. The concluding chapter lists procedures and criteria for program evaluation.

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF SINGLE BOARDS & COORDINATING COUNCILS IN RELATION TO PROGRAM APPROVAL

The primary data upon which this study is based was a letter to the directors and/or chancellors of 35 state boards or councils of higher education. There was a total of 30 responses, furnishing varying amounts of data. Several states that did reply appear to be in an earlier developmental stage than Utah in terms of program coordination. The data from these states were omitted because of the embryonic planning stage.

The following information represents a state-by-state analysis of single boards and councils of higher education in the United States. The investigation is concerned with the structure, authority, responsibility, and institutional guidelines for the approval of new programs.

Program in this study refers to any new unit of instruction, research, or administrative structure.

SUMMARY OF SINGLE BOARDS & COORDINATING COUNCILS

IN RELATION TO PROGRAM APPROVAL

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Governor with the consent of the senate for terms of four years. In addition, an advisory committee to the Commission consisting of nine members is also available for assistance in higher education.

Authority

The Commission on Higher Education shall have the responsibilities applicable to all post-high school programs in the State, including the junior colleges and the extension programs of existing colleges and universities, supported in whole or in part by state funds.

Responsibility

The Legislature of the State of Colorado has established the Commission on Higher Education with certain assigned responsibilities. These responsibilities are:

1. To provide opportunities for post-high school education for the State of Colorado.
2. To avoid needless duplication of facilities in programs in institutions of higher education.
3. To achieve simplicity in state administrative procedures pertaining to higher education.
4. To affect the best utilization of available resources so as to achieve an adequate level of higher education in the most economical manner.

5. To continue to recognize the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of the existing governing boards of institutions of higher education.

Approval of New Programs

The Commission reviews the proposal for any new degree program before its establishment in any institution, and transmits its decision to the institution within ninety days after receipt of such a proposal. No institution in Colorado can establish a new degree program without first securing the approval of the Commission.

The Commission makes recommendations to the Governor and the joint budget committee of the General Assembly on the establishment of state-supported institutions of higher education.

Existing Programs

The Commission reviews existing or proposed non-degree programs and makes recommendations to the governing boards of the respective institutions and the General Assembly as to the costs thereof.

It further recommends to the respective governing boards of such institutions degree programs which could be eliminated or consolidated because they constitute unnecessary duplication or because there are other good and sufficient causes for their elimination or consolidation. Conversely, it recommends programs which could be added to present programs of such institutions consistent with their roles and functions.

Extension Programs

The Commission has the responsibility of developing a unified program of extension offerings, recognizing the responsibility of the State to provide, to the extent possible, higher education in communities remote from a campus, and the need to integrate the extension functions of state-supported institutions of higher education.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes (Proposals for New Degree Programs)

Procedures for review by Colorado Commission on Higher Education

1. Institutions are invited to consult with the Commission staff concerning proposals for new degree programs well in advance of submission of formal proposals for Commission review, so that any specific considerations or questions relating to the proposal can be explored informally.
2. The governing board of the institution should take appropriate action on the proposal prior to submission to the Commission for review.
3. Without intending the following points as a rigid format for proposals, the Commission will desire the information indicated below on proposed new degree programs:
 - a. Description of the proposed program.
 - b. Relation of proposed program to present offerings and to long-range plans of the institution.
 - c. Reasons for adding the proposed program.

- d. Implications of new program for staff, space, library resources, and any other cost factors.
 - e. Relation to offerings of other institutions in Colorado and in the region.
 - f. Provisions for administration of new program.
 - g. The review the proposal has had inside the institution or by outside experts; nature of appraisal of outside reviewers.
- It is the Commission's position that whenever the proposed program represents either a venture into academic areas new to the proposing institution or a program on the doctoral level, the proposed program should be reviewed by a qualified person or persons independent of the proposing institution. If the Commission concurs in the designation of such persons prior to their appointment, it will accept their review. Otherwise, the Commission may obtain for its own use, an appraisal by qualified personnel independent of the institution concerned.
- h. Proposed date for initiating the program.
 - i. Action of governing board and date thereof.

CONNECTICUT COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Commission for Higher Education consists of sixteen members; one trustee from the University of Connecticut, one from the State

College Board, one from the Community College Board, and one from the State Board of Education, plus twelve members appointed by the Governor.

Responsibility

The State of Connecticut actually has four boards for higher education, each with a different responsibility. There is a board of trustees for the University of Connecticut, a board of trustees for the state colleges, a board of trustees for the community colleges, and the State Board of Education, which has the responsibility for state technical institutions and programs leading to the associate degree in applied science.

Each board of trustees maintains its responsibility for the operation of its institution or group of institutions.

Duties

The duties are as follows:

1. Be responsible for coordination of planning for higher education throughout the State, encourage the governing boards of the constituent units to initiate necessary plans for development of higher education, and require any state-supported institution of higher education to submit its plans for development.
2. Establish an advisory council for higher education with representatives from public and private institutions to study methods for coordinating efforts of all such institutions in providing a stimulating and enriched educational environment for the citizens of the State.

3. Conduct research and studies concerning the State's provision of higher education.
4. Make an impartial assessment of the legislative proposals and budgetary requests for higher education and report thereupon to the Governor and the General Assembly.

FLORIDA BOARD OF REGENTS

Structure

The Board of Regents of the institutions of higher education in Florida are composed of nine members appointed by the Governor and confirmed by both the State Board of Education and the Senate.

Authority

The Board of Regents is subservient to the State Board of Education. The latter exercises general supervision--control over the Board of Regents at all times.

The Board of Regents is authorized and empowered, subject to the approval of the State Board of Education to establish the policies, rules, and regulations under which the university system shall be managed and operated by the respective heads of the institutions and agencies.

Responsibility

The responsibilities of the Board of Regents are as follows:

1. Subject to the provisions of existing law, the Board reviews, amends and approves all budgets in the state university system.

The Board, in turn, presents to the Legislature all requests for appropriations.

2. Approves the programs of instruction and the different branches of learning to be offered and maintained at each of the several institutions, including alterations and changes.
3. Coordinates all programs under its jurisdiction in order to insure their efficient administration.
4. Conducts, through its staff, continuous studies of each institution to determine whether policies and regulations of the system are being followed, and to determine how efficiently and effectively the staff and facilities are being used.
5. Conducts, through its staff, continuous studies of the immediate future needs of the State in higher education, including research and public services.

Program Approval

Approval must be secured from the Board of Regents before a new academic program can be initiated or major changes may take place in existing programs.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

Below are outlined procedures for preparing proposals for new graduate programs. While similar information is required for new undergraduate programs, the documentation need not be as complete.

Proposals for new graduate programs should include a clear description of what the program is to be, why the institution believes it

should offer this degree, specific details concerning the need for the program, the faculty and resources currently available, and the cost of providing additional faculty and resources necessary to implement the proposed program.

The departments proposing new graduate programs are asked to provide the above information by completing a questionnaire developed by the Council for Academic Affairs of the State Board of Regents. (This questionnaire is found in Appendix B, with a detailed outline of the specific information requested for proposed new graduate programs.)

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

Approval of New Programs

The official policy of the Regents of the University System of Georgia for the approval of new degree programs follows:

In Georgia, any new degree programs or new major programs of academic work cannot be added to an institution's curricula unless recommended by the head of the institution concerned, the Chancellor, and the Committee on Education and approved by the Board. Specifically, the Board requests the following information:

1. Explanation of the new degree or program requested.
2. The need and justification for offering this work at the institution.
3. Will the work duplicate similar offerings in other units of the system?

4. Listing of names and qualifications of faculty involved in this work.
5. How would the program be financed?
6. What would be the future needs if the program or degree is approved?
7. What approval has been given to this program of work on the requesting institution's campus (committees of faculty, etc.)?
8. How many students would be involved in this new degree or new program now? After five years?

Changes or Additions to Existing Programs

The policy in the State of Georgia for changes or additions to existing programs follows:

1. The president of each institution of the University System shall submit each year to the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, prior to the November monthly meeting of the Board, a report on the degrees presently offered at his institution with the recommendations for any changes in degrees or for any additional degrees, and with any other information that may be derived by the Chancellor.
2. The Chancellor of the University System shall study these recommendations and present them with his recommendations to the Committee on Education for consideration and action.
3. The Committee on Education shall submit to the Board of Regents, each year at the regular December monthly meeting, recommendations

for changes in present degrees or additional degrees at the institutions of the University System. The Board shall take action on these recommendations at this meeting.

4. The Board of Regents shall not take action on recommendations for changes in degrees or for additional degrees at the institutions of the University System at any other meeting of the Board.

ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Board of Higher Education consists of thirteen members; eight appointed by the Governor. Insofar as possible, these eight members are selected on the basis of their knowledge, interest, and/or experience in problems of higher education. The other five members are the Chairmen of the Boards of Trustees of the colleges and universities in Illinois.

Responsibility

The Board of Higher Education analyzes the present and future aims, needs, and requirements of higher education in the State of Illinois. From this analysis, a master plan is prepared for the development, expansion, interpretation, coordination, and efficient use of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education for public institutions, in the areas of teaching, research, and public service. A special responsibility of the Board is to conduct a study of the needs for

additional programs in the health professions and the determination of the geographic location of such new programs.

The Board shall engage in a continuing study and evaluation of the Master Plan, and it shall be its responsibility to recommend, from time to time, amendments and modifications of the Plan, as enacted by the General Assembly.

Authority

The governing boards of the University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University, as well as other boards of universities and state colleges, and the junior college board programs are all subject to approval by the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

Further, the separate governing boards of the University of Illinois and other state-supported institutions shall retain all of the powers and duties heretofore given and conferred upon them, except as they are limited by the powers and duties assigned to the State Board of Higher Education. The latter appears in the sections below.

New Program Approval

An institution may not establish any new unit of instruction, research, or public service without the approval of the Board. The term "new unit of instruction, research, or public service" includes the establishment of a college, school, division, institute, department, or other unit in any field of instruction, research, or public service, not heretofore included in the program of instruction, and includes the establishment of any new branch or campus of the institution.

Each governing board must submit to the Board all proposals for any new unit of instruction, research, or public service. The Board of Higher Education may approve or disapprove the proposal in whole or in part, or approve modifications thereof, whenever, in its judgment, such action is consistent with the objectives of the Master Plan.

Illinois Approval for New, Advanced (Sixth-Year Degree) or Doctoral Programs

The Board usually refers the proposal to a jury panel called "Commission of Scholars" for review and recommendation. The Commission of Scholars is composed of nine eminent authorities in the field of graduate work, four of whom originate within Illinois institutions. Thus far, the Board of Higher Education has followed the advice of the Commission of Scholars, approving the programs the Commission has approved and disapproving those the Commission has rejected.

Approval of New Junior College Programs

The Board is now beginning to institute a new system of clearance of junior college programs. One of the advantages of the junior college approval process is that the institution will submit an initial form which shows their intent to plan a curriculum. This early notification will help the Board establish a preliminary dialogue with the institution and encourage or discourage further planning, depending upon the appropriateness of the program for the role of the institution. The purpose here is to avoid considerable needless planning of programs which may be

rejected after the institution has committed its resources toward a year or two of planning the program.

Existing Programs

Any "reasonable and moderate" extensions of existing curricula, research, or public service programs which have a direct relationship to existing programs do not need Board approval. The Board determines what is reasonable and moderate.

The Board is authorized to review periodically all existing programs of instruction, research, and public service, and to advise the appropriate board in control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified.

The Board evaluates the budget requests from each institution for the coming biennium. The Board in evaluating the budgets, considers such items as tuition rates and the current and projected utilization of the physical plant.

Extension Programs

The Board establishes general policies regarding changes to be made for extension, adult education, and public service programs.

Admission Standards

The Board establishes minimum standards of admission for all institutions.

Non-Instructional Facilities

Each state institution shall submit its plans for capital improvement of non-instructional facilities to the Board for approval before

final contracts are signed. Non-instructional uses include dormitories, unions, field houses, stadiums, and other recreational facilities and parking lots. If the project is found by a majority of the Board not to be consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education, and with instructional buildings provided for therein, such capital improvements shall not be made.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

The institutional request¹ for approval of a new program should contain the following:

1. A description of the proposed new unit.
2. The date on which it is sought to become effective.
3. The reasons which support the proposal.
4. Examples of similar programs, if any, operated by other institutions in Illinois and in other states.
5. Estimated cost of operating the proposed new unit during the first full year of operation.
6. Estimated cost of operating the proposed new unit during its sixth full year of operation if it is not previously terminated.
7. The date on which the program is expected to terminate.
8. Any other data appropriate to adequate analysis of the request.

¹See Appendix C for the actual forms used for institutional requests in Illinois.

IOWA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Structure

The Iowa State Board of Regents consists of nine members appointed by the Governor, nominated from the State at large, solely with regard to their qualifications and fitness to discharge the duties of office.

Authority and Responsibility

In addition to the several institutions of higher education, the State Board of Regents also has control and supervision over the Iowa School for the Blind, the School for the Deaf, the State Sanitarium, and the State Hospital School.

For these institutions, including those of higher education, the Board directs the expenditures of all appropriations made to the respective institutions.

The Board is required biannually to report to the Governor and the Legislature such facts, observations, and conclusions respecting each institution as, in the judgment of the Board, should be considered by the Legislature.

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

The State of Kansas' Board of Regents has no formal procedures which are required in the presentation of proposals for new programs. However, the Board does initially ask the petitioning institution to make a determination as to whether the new program is within the scope of the mission of the institution. The Board will also closely consider the financial requirements of the proposed new programs.

In addition to institutional justification of a new program, the Board frequently requests the institution to augment their own report with consultant reports from the Council of Graduate Schools to be sure that the program has been evaluated--not only by the institution faculty, but by outsiders as well.

Although, in general, the approval of a new program is rather easily obtained by the institution, the Board is refusing to adopt new programs in an increasing number of cases, unless it can be determined that the educational system will suffer because of the lack of the program.

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Board is composed of eleven members, seven of which are appointed by the Governor; one to be a member of the Board of Trustees of a private institution in Massachusetts, one a member of the Massachusetts Council AFL-CIO, and two of whom are women. No appointive member may be employed by an educational institution or by the State of Massachusetts. Also, no person serving as a trustee for any public institution of higher education may be an appointive member.

Authority

The State Board of Higher Education is located functionally within the State Department of Education. However, it is functionally autonomous and not subject to the control of the latter. The Board of Higher Education does have a mandate for state institutional control and coordination.

Responsibility

The general powers and duties of the Board of Higher Education are:

1. To facilitate, support, and delineate functions and programs for public institutions of higher education.
2. To allocate to them the responsibility and autonomy to discharge such functions.
3. To plan and develop efficient and effective coordination among the state-supported institutions; provided, however, that the termination of individual courses within a general program of study shall be the sole responsibility of each public institution.
4. The Board shall coordinate such educational services as are common to all segments and institutions of public higher education.
5. The Board shall review the annual budget and capital outlay requests of public institutions of higher education and the segments in public education as a whole.

New Program Approval

The Massachusetts Board of Higher Education has the responsibility for approving new degrees and major new programs, including the establishment of branches or campuses. The Board's philosophy in these matters is that plans should be well formulated so as to provide for the orderly growth of public higher education, as a whole, and in each of its components.

Further, the Board may authorize, upon approval of the governing board concerned, the transfer of an institution from one segment of public higher education in another; i.e., a state college becoming a university.

Existing Programs

The Board has the power to authorize, "upon the approval of the governing board concerned, the termination of any program or degree." More broadly speaking, the Board may initiate changes in functions and program of the state institutions involved.

At a lower level, the Board has neither the responsibility, nor power for approving new courses or format of courses, or reorganization of material within existing programs.

Institutional Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

There exist no rigid guidelines for curriculum modifications or additions, except that the same body of information is requested that the trustees used in granting their approval at their own institutions, prior to the forwarding of the request to the Board. In this particular Board's experience, there is a great deal of variance in the amount of information the trustees of the various institutions require. Plans are currently underway to standardize this procedure before the end of 1968.

MICHIGAN BUREAU OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Authority

The constitutional charge to the Michigan State Board of Education, in relation to higher education is:

1. To do general planning and coordination,
2. To provide general supervision of public community and junior colleges, and
3. To advise the Legislature as to financial requirements.

Responsibility

The responsibility of the State Board of Education is to do overall planning and coordinating, based on recommendations submitted by the Bureau of Higher Education.

New Program Approval

The inauguration of new programs by individual institutions is considered to be clearly related to planning and coordination at the state level; and, on this basis, must be reviewed by the Board in the context of overall planning and coordination. An institution has the opportunity to appeal to the State Board of Education when the staff of the Bureau of Higher Education has indicated that a particular program will not be recommended for support. However, if the State Board of Education concurs with the staff recommendation, the institution still has recourse to submit an appeal of its case to the Executive Office and subsequently to the Legislature.

New academic programs (new degree programs, majors, and other significant new combinations of courses offered for credit) are reported on academic program forms. All new academic programs to be financed in whole or in part from state appropriations or student fees are reported on these forms in order to permit their review from the standpoint of overall planning and coordination, and of state financial support.

Existing Programs

While the Board is concerned with state support for existing programs, the Higher Education Bureau does not usually seek additional information

from institutions beyond that already provided in executive appropriation requests.

An inventory of programs currently in existence in the several colleges and universities is being developed to be used as background information for evaluation of new program proposals.

Guidelines for New Curricula

Following receipt of new program forms, an analysis is made to determine if the program should receive routine review or whether a more detailed analysis is indicated.

1. Routine review procedures are used for new academic programs, which are:
 - a. Closely related to the established program and stated goals of the institution,
 - b. Comparable with a statewide plan for the development of higher education, and
 - c. Responsive to an established need.
2. Detailed review procedures are used for new programs not suitable for routine review, including those which require substantial new state funds. Such review, in cooperation with the institution, proceeds as rapidly as possible, but in some cases may take several months or longer.

The process for detailed program review consists of a six-step procedure:

1. Forwarding to the institution a copy of Guidelines For Submission of a Proposal and completion of this detailed form by the institution.
2. Review of the proposed program in relation to a state plan for higher education.
3. Analysis of the need for the proposed program.
4. Review of the detailed proposal prepared by the institution.
5. Recommendation of a committee of scholars, and
6. Staff recommendations to the State Board of Education.

MONTANA COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

Structure

The Council of Presidents is composed of seven members. These members are the presidents of the six units of the Montana University System and the Executive Secretary of the Montana University System.

Authority

The Council of Presidents is a regularly-constituted organization under the authority of the State Board of Education, ex-officio Regents of the Montana University System.

Responsibility

The Council of Presidents was created on September 11, 1967. It currently functions under the Board of Regents as advisor to the Regents in administrative, academic, and fiscal matters. The Council also functions under the direction of the Board of Regents as advisor to the

Board in the area of over-all coordination between the units of the Montana University System.

Program Approval

The procedure outlined below is essentially the same for new program approval and changes in already-existing programs.

1. The faculty members will propose to faculty councils requests for change.
2. The administration of a unit may request a change in institutional program.
3. These questions are usually passed on by the faculty senate or its equivalent.
4. The administrator of the unit will discuss this with the Council of Presidents.
5. The Council may or may not agree to the proposals; however, this does not prevent their submission to the Board of Regents. It is important to note here that a real adverse feeling on the part of the Council will usually prevent action by the Board until the problems or questions are resolved to the satisfaction of the Council.
6. The Council evaluates for the Board, the information submitted with the proposed curriculum change.
7. In the final analysis, it is the Board of Regents that accepts, rejects, or defers the request.

The program approval outline is tentative and subject to revision by the Board.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes to be Submitted to the University Council

Guidelines for all curriculum changes, as outlined by the Montana Council of Presidents, to be submitted to the University Council are as follows:

1. In relation to the staff:
 - a. Will this cause an addition to the staff ? If so, how many?
 - b. In what way will this proposal attract new faculty?
 - c. Have staff members in similar departments at the other units discussed this proposal? If so, what did they indicate?
2. In relation to the students:
 - a. Is the proposal a duplication within the unit; i.e., how many students, both graduate and undergraduate, are involved in this curriculum? (The undergraduate courses should be broken down into lower and upper division.)
 - b. Is the program being offered in another institution in Montana? If so, where and to what extent? What are the enrollments?
 - c. What are the projected number of graduates over a period of five years?
3. In relation to the courses:
 - a. Are courses presently being taught that would partially or completely satisfy the degree requirements? If so, what are the statistics for the courses?

- b. How many new courses are to be added and how many are required for the degree?
- c. Will this strengthen present degree offerings and how?
- 4. In relation to the facilities:
 - a. What will be the needs for the proposal for a period of ten years?
 - b. How will this growth fit into the overall development program? How about the development in related areas?
- 5. In relation to the budget:
 - a. What are the projected increased costs over the present biennium?
 - b. Over the next five years?
- 6. In relation to the Master Plan:
 - a. How does the proposal fit into the Master Plan?
 - b. Should the Master Plan be altered because of this recommendation if approval is granted?

The Montana Council of Presidents defines a "curriculum change" as being:

- 1. Course changes which alter the basic purpose of the institutional program;
- 2. a change in degree program offering;
- 3. a change in major or minor offering;
- 4. course changes which lead toward new degree offerings, course name changes, or credit change within an existing minor, major,

or degree offering shall not be considered a curriculum change and shall not require university committee review.

NEW JERSEY BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Board is composed of fifteen regular members, plus two ex-officio members without vote (the Chancellor, the Board's executive officer, and the State Commission of Education).

Authority

Effective July 1, 1967, the New Jersey Board of Higher Education was granted jurisdiction over all state-supported higher education, which included Rutgers, the State University, the six state colleges, the county colleges, the public junior colleges, the industrial schools, and any other university. State colleges or state-supported institutions established at a later date will also be under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Board of Higher Education.

Responsibility

1. To advance long-range planning for the system of higher education as to the whole in the State.
2. Establish general policy for the governance for the separate institutions.
3. Coordinate the activities of the individual institutions which, taken together, make up the system of higher education in New Jersey.

4. Maintain general financial oversight of the state system of higher education.
5. Develop and maintain a comprehensive master plan which shall be long-range in nature and be regularly revised and updated.

New Program Approval

The criteria, as listed by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education, for new program approval follows:

1. The Board has the power to establish new colleges, schools, units, divisions, institutes, departments, branches, and campuses, as required by the Master Plan, provided that provision is made therefor in the annual or a supplemental or special appropriation act of the Legislature.
2. Establish minimum admission standards for all public institutions of higher education, except that nothing in the act shall be construed to prevent individual institutions from establishing higher minimum admission requirements.
3. Establish minimum standards for all public institutions of higher education for degree granting, for the approval of new programs or degrees, and the approval of discontinuance of degrees and educational programs, as required.
4. Receive all budget requests from institutions, coordinate and balance such requests, and submit a combined request for appropriation annually to the Governor.

Existing Programs

The criteria, as listed by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education, for existing programs follows:

1. Review periodically existing programs of instruction, research, and public service in the public institutions of higher education and advise them of desirable changes.
2. Exercise enforcement powers.
3. Exercise visitorial general powers of supervision and control over such institutions of higher education as may be utilized by the State. Its visitorial general power of supervision and control are loosely defined as visiting such institutions of higher education for examination into their manner of conducting their affairs and to enforce an observance of the laws of the State.

Other Activities

Other activities of the Board include the following:

1. Encourage cooperative programs by institutions of higher education.
2. Assist in coordination of state and federal activities relating to higher education.

NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF REGENTS

Structure

The Board of Regents has as its staff, the State Education Department (now about 3500 employees), which includes a substantial number of

professional higher educators. The group responsible for higher education of the Board of Regents is the Division of Higher Education and the Division's Bureau of College Evaluation is the unit that actually reviews the proposals, makes institution visits, etc.

Authority

In the State of New York, the statewide planning, coordinating, and governing body for all education is the New York State Board of Regents. The Regents' authority extends over both public and private education.

Responsibility

The responsibility for chartering all colleges and universities in the State, granting their degree powers, and accrediting their courses of study, both undergraduate and graduate, has been given to the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Regents.

New Program Approval

The establishment of new colleges, branch campuses, the addition of new degree powers, adding to the level of instruction, and changing the name of the institution are all charter matters which require a formal, legal petition to the Board of Regents.

If, on the other hand, the addition of a new course of study (new curriculum or new degree program), does not require a legal petition from the Board of Regents, the requesting institution must still satisfy the Division of Higher Education that it is ready to take the step it is proposing.

The Board is not concerned with individual academic courses and, therefore, does not require approval of what is considered an integral academic reorganization. The Board does, however, respond to requests to provide consultative advice on any matter having to do with its colleges and universities.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

In addition to a formal body of knowledge, a certain sequence of steps are required of a university when requesting approval for a new program or curriculum.

1. The institution in the person of a dean or the President, inquires informally about what the Board requires in terms of documentation for such a proposal.
2. The proposal would next be sent to the Board for evaluation. Usually the Board requests additional information or clarification.
3. Next, the staff decides whether an institutional visit will have to be made. A visit is always made in the case of new degree powers, or the addition of a number of new curricula. If the institution wishes to introduce one or a few curricula, the documentary material submitted is evaluated with interim approval granted on this basis, pending a periodic accreditation visit.

Appendix D contains a Checklist and a Faculty Data Sheet, which have been reproduced to show what data is requested in preparation for an accreditation visit.

In general, the addition of new curricula and new levels of instruction, such as master's degree powers for four-year colleges or doctoral powers for institutions not previously authorized to do doctoral work, require complete documentation as follows:

1. The institution must show that there is need for the program, both in terms of an adequate source of students, and in appropriate cases, in terms of job opportunities after graduation.
2. The institution must satisfy the Board that the proposed program would not add to needless proliferation of such programs in the State and there must be no competition with existing institutions in the vicinity.
3. Documentation is required to show that the institution has the ability to carry out the program successfully in terms of:
 - a. financial resources;
 - b. material resources, such as equipment;
 - c. laboratories and space;
 - d. quantity and quality of faculty;
 - e. support of the proper kind in the library;
 - f. procedures assuring adequate standards of admission;
 - g. proper guidance of students;
 - h. all other safeguards associated with quality higher education, and
 - i. the proposed program must be in consonance with the avowed purposes of the education community in the State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The State Board of Higher Education in North Carolina consists of 15 citizens of the State, one of whom is a member of the State Board of Education, appointed by the Governor, but none of whom are officers or employees of the State or trustees of any state-supported institution of higher education.

Eight members of the Board are appointed by the Governor, four members are selected by the trustees of the state-supported senior colleges, two of whom are selected by the trustees of the University.

Authority

The Board possesses such powers as are necessary and proper for the exercise of its specific responsibilities, outlined in this section. In North Carolina, the State Board of Education and not the State Board of Higher Education has the sole authority to administer, at the state level, the system of community colleges, technical institutes, and industrial education centers.

Responsibility

The responsibilities, as outlined by the North Carolina Board of Higher Education, follow:

1. The primary responsibility of the Board of Higher Education shall be to plan and coordinate the major educational functions and activities of higher education in the State and to allot the functions and activities of the institutions of higher education.

2. The Board shall determine the types of degrees which shall be granted by each of the institutions.
3. The Board shall make visits to the institutions as it deems necessary and proper in the performance of its duties.
4. The Board has responsibility of reviewing each institution's biennial budget requests to determine whether the requests are consistent with the primary purposes of the institution and with the functions and activities allocated to the institution by statute or by the Board.

New Program Approval

Institutions under the jurisdiction of the Board will submit for the Board's action all proposals for new types of degrees. Institutions not currently authorized to offer graduate degree programs will submit, for the Board's action, all proposals for adding new degree programs (majors) and new degree titles. Institutions already authorized to offer master's degree programs will submit all new professional and graduate degree programs and new degree titles for the Board's action.

The Board defines a new degree program as one that lies in a field or area of study not already authorized for the institution proposing it or when it involves a higher level of degree than has previously been authorized for that field at that institution.

Existing Programs

In contrast to the above, approval is not generally required when an institution, by providing new arrangements for existing courses,

offers new options within authorized degree programs. There are times, however, when Board approval is necessary for changes in existing programs. In general, if there is a change which would represent a distinctly different purpose, philosophy, or program of studies, requiring substantial increases in faculty, facilities, or library holdings, the change should be fully described and forwarded to the Board for approval. In effect, a request for this type of change is treated as a new program request. What is actually meant by changes in existing programs are those of a less substantial nature which do not materially affect the nature of the degree program itself, although the Board should be kept informed of such changes. Single course changes within existing degree programs do not need Board authorization.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

Institutional procedures

A proposal to add a new degree program shall contain, where applicable, at least the following information:

1. A detailed description of the proposed program showing:
 - a. What degree will be awarded upon completion of the program.
 - b. How and why the program proposal was developed.
 - c. What the nature and objectives of the program are.
 - d. How it differs from existing programs at the institution.
 - e. How the proposed program is related to the statutory purposes of the institution.

- f. What benefits may accrue to the institution and to the State if the program is established.
 - g. What organizational arrangements will be employed in the administering of the program.
 - h. If a new organizational arrangement is proposed, a full description of it.
 - i. If appropriate, a description of the core of the curriculum; for the master's degree, an indication of the minimum number of hours required.
 - j. Attachment of tentative catalog description of the proposed program.
2. A statement describing the need for the program, including an indication of present and probable future student interest and demand for the program, and evidence of opportunities available to possible graduates of the program, if appropriate.
3. A description of resources (a) now available, and (b) needed for the proposed program including:
- a. Faculty involved (for proposals for graduate and professional degree programs, give rank, highest earned degree, bibliography, experience, specialization, and research interests and projects).
 - b. Library facilities as they relate to the program.
 - c. Necessary supporting courses, programs, or services.
 - d. Space requirements.
 - e. Other facilities and equipment or supplies necessary for the program.

4. A statement concerning the cost of the proposed program, showing cost estimates for new expenditures required in the early years of the program. Items which should be considered are projections of costs for faculty, service personnel, space, capital equipment, library and research facilities, scholarships and fellowship aid and assistance, and materials and supplies.
5. An indication of possible sources of funds other than state funds to meet the costs of the proposed program and of steps taken, if any, to obtain those funds. (For graduate programs, it should be shown what type of financial aid is available for students.)
6. A statement as to accreditation needed, if any, for the proposed program and plans for achieving accreditation.
7. A schedule or time table as to when the proposed addition will become operative, if approved by the Board.

In addition to all of the above required data, further information is requested for new graduate or professional degrees:

1. An indication that proposals have been referred to and considered by at least two outside consultants in the particular program area involved, whose consideration shall include a visit to the campus to review the proposed program and a written report to the appropriate officials of the institution.
2. The names, titles, and addresses of other persons outstanding in the field of the proposal on whom the Board might call for

additional advice, if it deems it to be necessary, should also be supplied.

Board Procedures

The decision of the Board concerning authorization of the degree proposal will be based upon:

1. Appropriateness of the program for the institution, as defined by the General Statutes.
2. The quality of the program with particular emphasis upon resources of institutions such as faculty, curriculum, library, and physical facilities.
3. The demonstrated need for the proposed program. It should be pointed out that authorizing a given institution to conduct a program does not necessarily mean that other institutions in the State will be denied an opportunity to offer identical or similar programs. It should be noted, however, that the Board may suggest inter-institutional collaboration and cooperation for certain programs.
4. In a subject matter area in which the Board has previously authorized an institution to offer a program at the doctorate or second professional degree level, and the institution subsequently requests approval to undertake a program in the same area at a lower level (master or first professional degree), the details required under the guidelines of the last section shall not be required. Such proposals shall come before the Board for action, but the proposal may take the form of a letter

setting forth the general outline of the program proposed and describing the need and rationalization therefor.

5. All proposals received by the Board will be referred for study and recommendations to the Educational Programs Committee of the Board. Additional advice and comment concerning proposals and institutional capacity to offer them may be sought by the Committee.
6. Each proposal will be acted upon by the Board within three months from the date of receipt. The Board may act upon proposals at any regular or called meeting at which a quorum of the members is present.
7. No proposed activity requiring Board of Higher Education approval may be advertised, or otherwise publicized prior to approval by the Board of Higher Education.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The State Board of Higher Education is composed of seven members who are appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve seven-year terms.

No board may have more than one alumnus from any one state-supported institution within North Dakota.

No person employed in a state institution may serve on the Board, or be eligible for board service until two years beyond the point of termination of service.

The Board employs a state commissioner of higher education as its executive officer.

Authority

All state-supported institutions in North Dakota are administered by the Board. The general authority and powers of the Board are:

1. The State Board of Higher Education shall have full authority over the institutions under its control with the right to prescribe, limit, or modify the courses offered at the several institutions.
2. In furtherance of its powers, the Board shall have the power to delegate to its employees details of the administration of the institutions under its control.
3. The Board shall have authority to organize or reorganize, within constitutional statutory limitations, the work of each institution under its control, and to do everything necessary and proper for the efficient and economical administration thereof.
4. The State Board of Higher Education shall have the control of the expenditure of the funds belonging and allocated to the institutions under its control and also of those appropriated by the Legislative Assembly for such institutions; however, funds appropriated by the Legislative Assembly and specifically designated for any one or more of such institutions shall not be used for any other institution.

Responsibility

The specific powers and duties of the Board of Higher Education are:

1. To coordinate and correlate the work in the different institutions, to minister to the needs and the proper development of each institution in harmony with the best interests of the people of the State, and to improve highest technical education in the State.
2. To act in consultation with the president of each institution, to minister to the needs and proper development of each institution in harmony with the best interests of the people of the State, and to improve higher and technical education in the State.
3. To adopt rules, regulations, and by-laws for the government of each of such institutions and for all the departments and branches thereof.
4. To elect and remove the president or other faculty heads, the professors, the instructors, the teachers, the officers, and the other employees of the several institutions under its control; to fix their salaries within the limits of legislative appropriations; to fix the terms of office; to prescribe the duties.
5. To make recommendations in regard to needed legislation for the institutions under its control.

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Structure

The Board of Regents consists of eleven members, nine appointed by the Governor. No appointive members of the Regents may be a trustee, officer, or employee of any public or private college or university. Further, the Chancellor shall not be a trustee officer or employee of any public or private college while serving the Board.

Authority

The Board has authority, by law, to approve or disapprove all new curricula, as well as having general management authority for the State's higher education system.

Responsibility

Some of the more important duties of the Board are:

1. Make studies of state policy in the field of higher education and formulate a master plan for higher education for the State, considering the needs of the people, the needs of the State, and the role of the individual, public, and private institutions within the State in fulfilling these needs.
2. Approve or disapprove the establishment of new branches or academic centers of state colleges and universities.
3. Approve or disapprove the establishment of state technical institutions or any other state institution of higher education.
4. Recommend the nature of the programs--undergraduate, graduate, professional, and state financed research and public services--

which should be offered by the State colleges, universities, and other state-assisted institutions of higher education in order to utilize, to the best advantage, their facilities and personnel.

5. Recommend to the State colleges, universities, and other state-assisted institutions of higher education, programs which could be eliminated because they constitute unnecessary duplication or for other good and sufficient cause.
6. Recommend which programs should be added to their present programs.
7. Conduct studies for state institutions of higher education to assist them in making the best and most efficient use of their existing facilities and personnel.

New Program Approval

The Board of Regents approves or disapproves all new degrees and new degree programs at all state colleges, universities, and other state-assisted institutions of higher education.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes--Procedure for Consideration of New Degrees and New Degree Programs, Other, Pre-Doctoral Degrees

Procedure for consideration

The procedures for consideration of new degrees and new degree programs follow:

1. Any state-assisted institution of higher education desiring to introduce a new degree or new degree program shall present such

request to the Ohio Board of Regents for approval or disapproval after all required internal clearances or approvals have been provided, including approval by the Board of Trustees or Board of Directors of the institution.

2. The proposal for a new degree or new degree program shall be presented to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents in ten copies. The proposal will provide the necessary information, as outlined below.
3. The proposal will be reviewed by the staff of the Board of Regents. If it is deemed desirable to do so, the Chancellor may refer the request to an advisory committee of the Board for evaluation in terms of need and in terms of standards of desired performance.
4. The Chancellor shall present a recommendation to the Board for approval or disapproval of each proposed new degree or each proposed new degree program received by the Board. The interested institution shall be given an opportunity to present a statement of position on the matter at the same time.
5. The Ohio Board of Regents will vote approval or disapproval of each new degree request or each new degree program request at an official and regularly-scheduled meeting of the Board.

Information needed

Each proposal for a new degree or new degree program shall provide the following information:

1. Designation of the new degree or new degree program, with a brief description of its purpose.
2. Description of proposed curriculum.
3. Administrative arrangements for the program: department and school or college involved.
4. Evidence of need for new degree or new degree program.
5. Prospective enrollment.
6. Faculty and facilities available for program and their adequacy.
7. Needs for additional facilities and staff and plans for meeting these needs.
8. Projected financial needs to support program and adequacy of expected subsidy and other income to meet these needs.
9. Information about use of consultants or advisory committees in the development of degree proposal or degree program proposal, with copies of reports from such consultants or advisory committees.

1

Procedures for consideration of new doctoral degree programs

The following is a reproduction of the major portion of the above-titled document, reproduced verbatim because it is one of the very few such documents that outline, in great detail, the procedures and guidelines to be followed by an institution wishing to inaugurate a new doctoral program. The request would be reviewed by the State Board of Regents.

¹Ohio Board of Regents (R.G. 1-07)

Procedure for consideration

1. The approval or disapproval of new doctoral degrees or degree programs is an action of great importance to the State of Ohio and to each state-assisted university and will be handled with appropriate care.
2. Approval or disapproval of new doctoral degrees and new doctoral degree programs will be voted on in a formal and official meeting of the Ohio Board of Regents, only after the most careful exploration and consideration of the merits of the proposal, by the staff, by an advisory committee, and by consultants, when advice is requested, with final review of all recommendations reserved for the members of the Board themselves.
3. In addition to the role of the staff of the Board of Regents in the encouragement, review, and coordination of new doctoral degree programs, the Chancellor is directed to consult the Advisory Committee on Graduate Study, to consist of one representative from each state-assisted university, in the planning and review of proposed doctoral programs.
4. Because the planning of doctoral programs requires long-range commitments of staff and other resources by a state-assisted university, it is desirable to have two distinct steps in the approval procedure. The first action will be "approval of doctoral program for planning purposes" and the second action will be "approval of new degree program" which constitutes final authorization. Ordinarily, when the first approval has been

given by the Board of Regents, the final authorization will follow if and when all necessary planning procedures have been completed.

Approval for planning purposes

1. A state-assisted university will submit to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents a statement of proposal when the university desires to seek approval of a doctoral degree program for planning purposes.
2. This statement of proposal shall include the following information:
 - a. The designation and general nature of the proposed program described in a statement of about five pages covering the points to be discussed in detail in the proposal.
 - b. Declaration of interest in and willingness to support the proposed program.
 - c. Description of proposed program, with particular attention to any unique characteristics.
 - d. Institutional justification for the proposed program.
 - e. Current resources of staff, library, facilities, and students for proposed program.
 - f. Current weaknesses and plan for eliminating these, with indication of expected timetable.
 - g. Organizational arrangements for graduate study generally and for development of proposed program.

- h. Planned budget year by year for the next five years.
- 3. Upon receipt of fifteen copies of the proposal for planning purposes, the Chancellor will provide copies to members of the Advisory Committee on Graduate Study and will consult with them about the need for such a program and the desirability of approving or disapproving the program for planning purposes.
- 4. Upon advice of the Advisory Committee, the Chancellor may make arrangements to retain one or more consultants from outside the State of Ohio to review the need for the proposed program and the feasibility of the planning arrangements for the proposed program.
- 5. The following criteria are of major importance in the approval of a new doctoral program:
 - a. Evidence of a need for additional Ph.D. student capacity and Ph.D. recipients.
 - b. Evidence of a local need and of local resources for a particular Ph.D. program.
 - c. Experimental and innovative Ph.D. plans.
 - d. Ph.D. programs needed to support and to develop existing Ph.D. programs.
 - e. Evidence of existing resources upon which to build a Ph.D. program (staff resources and quality, facility resources, and a strong master's program).
 - f. Concentration of effort by individual institutions upon selected Ph.D. programs.

6. The Chancellor will submit his recommendation to the Board of Regents upon each proposed doctoral program for planning purposes.

Approval of proposed doctoral degree program

1. After a state-assisted university has received approval for planning purposes of a proposed doctoral degree program, the university will proceed with its planning activity.
2. The state-assisted university will keep the Chancellor or the Board of Regents informed about progress in planning the doctoral program, and the Chancellor will keep the Advisory Committee on Graduate Study informed of this progress.
3. When a state-assisted university considers itself ready to introduce the new doctoral degree program, the university will request final authorization of the program by the Ohio Board of Regents.
4. This request will be accompanied by fifteen copies of a final report on the proposed doctoral degree program. This report will include the following information:
 - a. Review of proposed program.
 - b. Review of progress in acquiring staff and other resources for program.
 - c. Review of plans for recruitment of students and projection of anticipated enrollment.
 - d. Review of plans for financial support.
 - e. Status of arrangements for provisional accreditation.

5. Upon receipt of request for program approval, the Chancellor will distribute this to members of the Advisory Committee on Graduate Study and will obtain the Committee's evaluation of the satisfactory status of progress.
6. If, after consultation with the Advisory Committee, the Chancellor is satisfied that the plans have not progressed to the point where the state-assisted university is prepared to undertake the proposed program, the Chancellor shall so advise the state-assisted university and suggest further preparation. If the university wishes to protest this recommendation, the university may submit its protest at a meeting of the Board of Regents.
7. The Board of Regents may approve, disapprove, or postpone action on proposed doctoral programs.

Effectiveness

The procedure established by this rule shall be effective for all doctoral degree programs submitted to the Board of Regents after January 1, 1967.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Board of Regents contains nine members, appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of nine years. None of the Regents may be employees or staff members of any state institution in Oklahoma.

Authority

The Regents have the authority to prescribe all standards of higher education application to each institution and to determine the function and course of study of each institution.

Responsibility

The responsibilities of the Board of Regents are as follows:

1. The Regents serve as the coordinating board for all state institutions of higher education, including the state-supported junior colleges, the military academy, and the geographical survey.
2. The Regents are the degree-granting agency for each of the state-supported institutions of higher education.
3. The Regents set admission and graduation standards for each institution in keeping with the assigned function and course of study.
4. Before each session of the Legislature, the Regents file one consolidated budget request with the Governor and state fiscal agency for all higher education. The Regents receive one lump appropriation for all state-supported higher education, and allot the proper portion of the State appropriation to each member institution.
5. The Regents make such studies and such resulting recommendations as the need indicates regarding higher education in Oklahoma.

Program Approval

Approval must be secured by any state institution from the Board of Regents in adding or deleting any new programs and courses.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

The Oklahoma State Regents have not, as yet, adopted a definite set of criteria which must be submitted by institutions under their jurisdiction. However, the State Regents presently operate under the following general guidelines.

Twice a year, in January and in July, the State Regents act upon requests from the 18 colleges and universities in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education to effect changes in present courses and programs of study. In requesting new courses, the institutions are asked only to list the course number, the department, the number of credit hours for which the course is being offered, and a description of the course content. The same procedure is followed in the deletion of old courses. The approval of individual courses is almost a proforma procedure, and so particular justification is asked for whenever an institution makes a request for course changes.

In the case of an institution desiring new offerings in a whole new program, information of a more detailed nature is required. The administration is asked to provide a variety of information, including the societal justification and need for the program, the number of students desiring to major in the program, the resources to be needed in carrying out the program (including faculty resources already available), and financial resources not yet available, and like information.

Whenever the State Regents receive a program request from an institution, they attempt to ascertain whether or not there is a societal need for the program; if so, they then must decide whether or not the new program belongs at the requesting institution or at some other institution.

In the case of a Ph.D. or a professional program, the Regents will probably convene an advisory committee, composed of people from the two state universities, to render counsel with regard to the need and the proper location of the program. After this process, the Regents' staff will then prepare a recommendation for the State Regents, whose decision is final.

In making their decision with regard to new programs, the State Regents prefer to have access to the total information on the legislative history of the program at the institutional level. That is, they like to know what action has been taken at the departmental, college, and university-wide levels--as well as at the governing board level--whenever a new program is asked for by an institution. The State Regents do not want to authorize programs at those institutions whose faculties have not recommended the new programs.

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Board consists of nine regents, appointed by the Governor, with the consent of the Senate. No member may serve if he is connected with any state institution of higher education under the State Board.

Authority and Responsibility

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education operates under the following lines of authority and responsibility:

1. To control and manage the property of all state-supported institutions.
2. To establish and collect fees for admission and tuition.
3. To prescribe qualifications for admission for each separate institution, research, extension, educational, and other activities thereof.
4. To take charge of all relationships between the higher educational institutions and the State Legislature.
5. To exert full authority or power over the curricula and departments of each institution. The Board is charged with the responsibility for visiting the university and other state-supported institutions inquiring as to the work offered and conducted, whenever and as often as deemed necessary.

Program Approval

Under the Board policy, institutions of the State system may add or drop curricula of courses only with the approval of the Board of Higher Education.

The Board's decisions on any proposed new curricular program must rest upon a solid base of factual data relating to the extent and the nature of the need the State has for the proposed new program, the capacity of the requesting institution to offer a high-quality program,

and the costs of the State--both initial and long term--of financing a high-quality program of the kind being requested.

In regards to course proliferation, the Board takes a firm stand. The Board specifically makes a determination of what courses or departments, in its judgment, should not be duplicated in the several higher educational institutions. The Board may direct the elimination of duplicate work from any institution, and determine and define the courses of study and departments to be offered and conducted by each institution. On this matter, any person may appear before the Board of Higher Education for a hearing, so as to lay before the Board data or arguments for maintaining or eliminating any duplicated course or department.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

The Board anticipated that the institutions requesting new programs or the expansion of existing programs where Board authorization is required will present to the Board the factual data which the institution found persuasive in coming to the decision to request the program.

Proposed curricular changes submitted to the Board's office by the presidents of the institutions are subject to further review at three levels within the Board's operation, as follows:

1. The Board's office (Office of Academic Affairs) makes a careful analysis of all curricular requests. It presents this written analysis to the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs, with a recommendation that the Committee recommend to the Board the approval, disapproval, or deferment of action on the proposal to allow further study.

2. The Board's Committee on Academic Affairs schedules a meeting for consideration of the curricular proposal. The institution's written presentation of its proposal and the Office of Academic Affairs' analysis of the proposal form the basis for the discussion which is participated in by representatives of the institution, the Board's office, and the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs, supplemented by such other members of the Board as find it possible to attend. Out of the Committee's meeting develops the Committee's recommendation to the Board that the Board approve, disapprove, or defer for further study the proposal in question.
3. At the next meeting of the Board of Higher Education, the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs presents its report to the Board with its recommendations for Board action. Before acting upon the Committee's recommendation, the Board offers opportunity for further discussion by any interested parties, including institutional representatives, the Board's office or the Board members themselves.

Graduate and Professional Education

Guidelines for new graduate and professional education programs must be spelled out in great detail within a specified format. Simply requesting factual data which the institution finds persuasive in coming to their own decision in requesting the program is not sufficient. The rationale for requesting such detailed information is that professional and advanced programs tend to be highly expensive, taxing the resources

of the State; therefore, it is difficult to develop a high-quality program at any single institution without a proper allocations system for the development of which considerable factual data is necessary.

Specifically, these guidelines are:

1. The Board will consider each request on its merits. Institutions making such requests should be expected to evaluate their proposals for the Board in such terms as the following:
 - a. The relationship of the proposal program to the objectives of the institution as these are apparent in the approved state system of institutional guidelines.
 - b. The relationship of the proposed program to existing programs in the same field. Is the new program intended to supplement, complement, or duplicate existing state system programs? In the light of the existing state system programs in the same field, why is the proposed new program needed? Is it designed to serve primarily a regional need? A state need?
 - c. The growth prospects of the proposed program. How many students will it serve now? In the immediate future? In a long-ranging future?
 - d. If it seems pertinent to the subject area in question, the employment opportunities for persons prepared in the proposed program.
 - (1). What facilities has the institution appropriated to the needs of a high-quality program in the field

(library, laboratory, or other facilities and equipment)?

- (2). How many faculty members are qualified to participate in the program?
 - (3). Does the institution have such related undergraduate and graduate programs as may be essential to give needed support to the proposed new program?
 - (4). What elements of the program, if any, are presently in operation at the institution?
 - (5). In instances in which the institution has an undergraduate program in the subject area or field in question, has the undergraduate program been fully accredited by the appropriate accrediting agency?
- e. The cost implications of the proposed program--both current and capital costs. What is estimated to be the total cost of instituting a high-quality program in the institution in the field of question--both immediate and long-range costs?
- f. The relationship of the proposed new program to future aspirations of the institution. Is the proposed program the first of several curricular steps the institution has in mind in reaching a long-term goal? What are the next steps to be if the Board approves the program presently proposed.
- g. Projected student credit hour cost of instruction in the

proposed program. Given the estimated costs of operating a program of excellence in the fields in question and the number of students who can be expected to enroll, will the student hour cost of the program be a reasonable one? If not, can the student credit hour cost be justified on any rational basis?

2. The Board will seek to inform itself concerning at least three other relevant questions:

- a. What is likely to be the impact of the proposed program upon similar programs in the State system? Professional programs tend to be expensive programs. If, by the addition of a second or third graduate and/or professional program in the same field in the State system, there would appear to be a threat to the continued accreditation of an existing program, the Board will wish to give approval to the new program only if the advantages to the State system of such approval outweigh the disadvantages if the program were approved.
- b. Can the same program be offered more efficiently or to the benefit of more students in some other institution of the State system?
- c. What other alternative means are there for meeting the needs which have been identified in the proposal?

General Policies Applying to Professional Programs

The following general policies will guide the Board in assessing

institutional requests for authorization of professional programs.

The Board will:

1. Approve a new professional program only if the Board feels assured of the availability, at the time or in the immediate future, of sufficient funds to develop the program to a respectable standing, to enable it to become accredited, and, once accredited, to maintain its accreditation. Cost estimates should be in terms of an on-going, high-quality program and not a minimal, beginning program.
2. Establish a principle that new professional programs, not before offered by the State system should be located at the most appropriate institution, considering such factors as the focus in the State system of supporting programs and other institutional or community resources required to give strength to the new program.
3. Establish the principle that, as a general policy, with perhaps some provision for planned exceptions for cause, if the State system's first program in a professional field is situated at the University of Oregon or Oregon State University, the second authorized program should be developed where it can serve the largest number of students at the least personal financial cost. The program at the resident institution would serve the entire state; the second program would serve primarily the needs of the students in the region in which the institution is located.

4. Establish the general principle that the Board will be reluctant to approve any professional program that, as it is conceived, cannot, within a reasonable period of time, be accredited. A professional education should offer a student basis for advancement in the field of flexibility of employment.

RHODE ISLAND COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

Authority and Responsibility

In 1960, Rhode Island created the post of Chancellor of State Colleges, and appointed the Chancellor as chairman of the Council of Presidents where consideration was to be given to any new programs recommended and consensus reached before it arrives at the Board of Trustees (the State organization with management authority), for their decision. In reality, the President may bypass the Council and, instead, may submit his program to the Board, even though it may not have been accepted at the Council of Presidents level. This latter course of action is infrequently involved, as the Council of Presidents is made up of the very same individuals who are, of course, the presidents of the respective institutions. In effect, they would be circumventing the very group to which they are a part.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

The three state institutions in Rhode Island are expected to provide relevant and complete information as to the needs, facilities required, faculty addition, if any, number of students, and the essential

costs involved. In addition, the Board expects background information as to whether or not there is a duplication in any of the sister institutions or the local private institutions and other factors of interest.

TEXAS COORDINATING BOARD

Structure

The Board is composed of eighteen members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. No member of the Board shall be employed professionally for remuneration in the field of education during his term. The Board shall appoint a commission of higher education as its chief executive officer.

Authority

The Board represents the highest authority in the State in matters of public higher education.

Responsibility

Some of the more important responsibilities of the Texas Coordinating Board are:

1. Develop and publish criteria to be used as a basis (a) for determining the need for changing the classification of any public institution of higher education, and (b) for determining the need for new public junior colleges, public senior colleges, and universities or university systems.
2. Classify and prescribe the role and scope for each public institution of higher education in Texas and make changes in

classification or role--scope of such institutions as it deems necessary.

3. Review periodically all degree and certificate programs offered by the institutions of higher education to assure that they meet the present and future needs of the State.
4. Order the initiation, consolidation, or elimination of degree or certificate programs where such action is in the best interests of the institutions themselves or the general requirements of the State of Texas, or when such action offers hope of achieving excellence by a concentration of available resources.
5. Develop and promote one or more degree or certificate programs to the highest attainable quality at each institution of higher education for which there is marked promise of excellence.
6. The Board shall enlist the cooperation of colleges and universities in developing a statewide plan for the orderly growth of the Texas system of higher education.

New Program Approval

No new department, school, degree, program, or certificate program shall be added at any institution of higher education, except with specific prior approval of the Board.

Existing Programs

Each governing board must submit to the Coordinating Board annually, a comprehensive list, by department, division, and school, of

all courses, course descriptions. etc., that will be required during the following academic year. The Board may order the deletion or consolidation of any such courses, after giving due notice as to its reasons and after providing a hearing, if one is requested by the governing board.

Research and Extension Programs

The Board has the responsibility to make continuing studies of the needs of the State for research and for extension and public services and to designate the institutions of higher education to perform research, public service, and extension programs for credit to specific geographic areas.

In addition, the Board maintains an inventory of all institutional and programmatic research, extension, and public service activities being conducted by the various institutions, whether financed by the State or not. Once a year, on dates prescribed by the Board, each institution of higher education reports to the Board all research conducted at such institutions during the last preceding year. All reports are subject to the limitations imposed by security regulations governing defense contracts for research.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes--Institutional Requests for New Instruction Degree-Granting Programs

Description of proposed program

The descriptions for any proposed program are as follows:

1. What is the title and nature of the proposed program?

2. What degree or certificate is contemplated, if any?
3. List the course offerings to comprise the program. Which of these courses will be new ones?
4. Outline a semester-by-semester curriculum for the proposed program.
5. What special requirements will be enforced? If a graduate degree is contemplated, is a thesis required? If not, what will be substituted?
6. Has the proposed program, or one similar to it, been offered in this institution at any time prior to this request?
7. How many similar programs are offered elsewhere in Texas? Where?
8. Justify the need for the proposed program. Be precise.
9. Is the proposed program approved by the institution's Board of Control? When?

Projected enrollment

1. Project the enrollment for the proposed program for the next five years. Explain the basis for this projection.
2. Explain the likely source of students who will enroll in this program. (Will they come from existing programs or will they be attracted to the institution to enroll in the proposed program?)

Faculty

1. Give the number of persons presently on the faculty who will be most directly involved in the proposed program. List for each faculty member the name, rank, highest degree, and present course load.
2. Calculate the present student-faculty ratio in the subject field(s) or department(s) in which the proposed program will be offered. (Divide full-time equivalent students by full-time equivalent faculty.)
3. Project the need for new faculty required for the proposed program for the next five years. If the proposed program will be absorbed in part or in whole by the present faculty, explain how this will be done.
4. Will acquisition of new faculty for the program require an unusual outlay of funds or unique recruiting techniques? Explain in detail.
5. Describe the involvement of the faculty--present and projected--in research, extension, correspondence, and other activities. Are teaching loads of faculty reduced if they engage in these activities?

Library

1. Are present library holdings in relevant fields adequate now to begin the proposed program? How will the library have to be improved to meet program needs in the next four years? (Refer to the need for books, periodicals, reference books,

primary source materials, etc.).

2. Are there libraries of other institutions which are being used or can be used by faculty and students in the proposed program? Explain in detail.
3. Estimate the total expenditure for the last two complete fiscal years for library acquisitions in the departments or sub-matter fields in which the proposed program will be offered, or in fields which are closely related to the proposed program.
4. Project library expenditures to be budgeted annually for the next five years to meet the need of this program.

Facilities and equipment

1. Describe existing facilities that are available for the proposed program. Describe the present utilization of these facilities. What new facilities will be needed in the near future? Specify what special facilities and equipment will be needed and estimate their cost. From what sources do you anticipate obtaining needed facilities and equipment?

Administration of proposed program

1. Will the proposed program affect the administrative structure of the institution? If yes, describe how. In what department, division, school, or college will the proposed program be administered? If the program is to have inter-departmental or inter-unit administration, explain in detail.

Accreditation

1. Describe the requirements for accreditation, if program is eligible to be accredited. What is the name of the accrediting agency? What will be initial costs of accreditation and subsequent annual costs to maintain it? Identify base criteria for accreditation and describe how these will be met.

Supporting fields

1. Evaluate the subject matter fields at your institution which may be considered as necessary or valuable in support of the proposed program? Will these fields need improvement? If so, how, to what extent, and to what cost? Be specific.

Costs of proposed program

1. Estimate the initial (first year) costs of the proposed program. How much of this will be absorbed in current budgets and how much will be newly-appropriated money? Will federal or private financial assistance be sought? If yes, explain in detail.
2. Estimate the annual cost of the program for the three years following its first year. (Use current formulas in arriving at your estimate.) Explain the rationale for your estimate.
3. Departmental costs:
 - (a). Show the departmental operating expenditures for the last two fiscal years for the departments which will

contribute significantly to the support of the proposed program.

(b). How will the proposed program affect the allocation or distribution of these funds?

4. What additional funds for research will be needed to support the proposed program? Explain.
5. How many graduate assistantships are considered desirable to begin the program? Estimate the amount of funds required for these assistantships over the next four years. What sources are available to support these assistantships? Will student aid funds be needed for undergraduates other than those provided for all undergraduates? Explain in detail.
6. Add any comments which would be helpful to the Coordinating Board in evaluating this program request.

Institutional Requests for New Departments, Divisions, Schools, or Colleges

Information required

1. What is the exact administrative change proposed?
2. Present organizational charts showing the present administrative scheme and the proposed administrative scheme.
3. What is the rationale for the proposed change? How would it improve the institution?
4. Explain in detail the current administrative load under the present organizational structure and that under the proposed

structure. Project these loads for the next four years, and explain the rationale for the projection.

5. Explain in detail the added costs of the proposed change.
 - (a). What new professional and clerical personnel will be added as a result of the change? (Project for four years.)
 - (b). What additional physical space will be required by the change? From what funds will this be provided and at what cost? How will these costs be met? (Project for four years.)
 - (c). What additional equipment (all types) will be required as a result of the change? At what estimated cost? (Project for four years.)
 - (d). Will the administrative change require that the current salary for any administrator or other professional person be increased?
 - (e). Will the proposed change be adequately funded by existing formula rates and appropriations? If not, explain what adjustments are contemplated.
6. Will the proposed change alter in any way the approved role and scope of the institution? If so, explain in detail.
7. Will the proposed change involve the institution (or any part of it) in new accreditation or in re-accreditation? If so, what are time requirements for this accreditation? What are basic criteria for the accreditation? What will be initial

costs of the accreditation process, and subsequent annual costs to maintain it?

8. Will the proposed administrative change require additional graduate or undergraduate student assistantships? If the answer is yes, explain in detail.
9. Will approval of the proposed change lead to additional or related proposals in other areas? If so, explain what and when.
10. Has the institution's governing board approved the proposed administrative and/or organizational change? (Give the date of the meeting at which the change was approved).

VIRGINIA STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Structure

The Council consists of nine members who are appointed by the Governor, subject to the confirmation by the General Assembly for terms of four years, plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who is ex-officio.

No officer, employee, trustee, or member of the governing board of any institution of higher education, no employee of the Commonwealth or member of the General Assembly, or no member of the State Board of Education is eligible for appointment to the Council, with the exception of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, who serves as an ex-officio member.

Authority

The Virginia State Council of Higher Education has management authority. Specifically, in the area of curriculum, the Council has the power, with the approval of the Governor in each instance, to limit any institution to such curriculum offerings as conform to the plans adopted by the Council.

Responsibility

The Council shall promote the development and cooperation of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education in the State of Virginia.

The Council is charged with the responsibility of assembling data and with the aid of the boards and officers of the several institutions of higher education in Virginia shall constitute a coordinated system. Such plans will indicate the responsibility of the individual institutions for developing programs in specified fields of undergraduate, graduate, and graduate-professional education.

Other Responsibilities

1. The Council visits and studies the operations of each institution at least once during each biennium, with other visits made as seem necessary.
2. In carrying out its duties, the Council, insofar as practical, attempts to preserve the individuality, traditions, and sense of responsibility of the respective institutions.

A concrete example of this philosophy is that the Council has no authority over the endowment funds now held or in the future received by any of the institutions. These funds are private and apart from the State administration system, and, therefore, help maintain a certain sense of fiscal responsibility and freedom of action within each institution.

3. The Council studies those questions requiring statewide policies in higher education and makes recommendations with respect to such questions to the institutions of higher education, to the Governor, or to the General Assembly--whichever is most appropriate. The Council shall seek the views and advice of the governing boards and officers of each institution in arriving at these policies.
4. The Council shall cooperate with the State Board of Education in matters of interest to both the public schools and the state-supported institutions of higher education, with particular reference to the coordination of college admission requirements and the teacher-training programs.

New Program Approval

No state institution shall establish any additional branch or division without first referring the matter to the Council for its information, consideration, and recommendation.

Extension Programs

The Council coordinates the off-campus extension and public service

offerings of all institutions including credit and non-credit courses and programs.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

All program proposals submitted to the Council should contain the following information:

1. Program classification
 - (a). Academic area or field of study, department, school, or college involved.
 - (b). Type and level of degree.
 - (c). Proposed date of establishment.
2. Program justification
 - (a). Purposes or objectives of the program.
 - (b). State and/or national needs for graduates.
3. Program expansion
 - (a). Additional courses required.
4. Students
 - (a). Student enrollment estimated initially and anticipated for the next three years (sources cited for estimates).
5. Faculty
 - (a). Current faculty available for program (number, rank, present, and anticipated work load).
 - (b). Additional faculty anticipated (number and rank).
6. Physical plant facilities

- (a). Existing facilities and major equipment (classrooms, research laboratories, etc.) available for program.
- (b). Estimated additional facilities and major equipment needs for three years and estimated cost.

7. Library resources

- (a). Current library resources which support program.
- (b). Estimated additional library resources needed for program and cost.

8. Cost

- (a). Estimate and basis of total costs to initiate program and anticipated cost for each of the first three years of operation.
- (b). Sources of income for program in addition to state support.

9. Date of approval by governing board of institution

In addition to requiring the above data, the Council may request the president of an institution, or those whom he may designate, to appear before it to discuss and/or supplement information provided in their own proposal.

The Council may also seek advice and comment concerning proposed programs from such disinterested educational leaders, consultants, and advisory groups as it may consider appropriate.

WISCONSIN COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR HIGHER EDUCATIONStructure

The Coordinating Committee consists of seventeen members composed of members of the several institutional boards of regents and nine citizens appointed by the Governor, with the consent of the Senate.

Authority

The Coordinating Committee is charged by statute with determining what overall educational programs shall be offered in the several units of the university; the state colleges; the collegiate transfer in technical education programs of the schools of vocational, technical, and adult education; and county teachers colleges to avoid unnecessary duplication and to utilize, to the best advantage, the facilities and personnel available for instruction in the field of higher education.

Although the Council's legislative charge gives it jurisdiction over the development of any new higher education programs in the State of Wisconsin, it has, up to this point, only reviewed new majors or new schools. The Council now is beginning to recognize that such self-imposed limitations may, in some cases, interfere with a coordinated planning function and it is now contemplating some method whereby it could, without excessive demands upon staff time, review new courses of study, new associate degree programs, or new programs at the minor level, which may have an impact upon the total State picture.

Responsibility

The responsibilities of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education are as follows:

1. The Committee shall adopt a coordinating plan for the integration and most efficient use of the existing facilities and personnel, and an order of priority for the construction of new facilities at the University of Wisconsin and the State colleges.
2. The Committee shall review the separate budget requests of the University and the State colleges and the State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult education, and shall recommend a single biennial budget to the Governor for the support of all institutions of higher education under its jurisdiction, retaining the identity of the appropriation request related to said institutions. It shall also review and make appropriate recommendations to the department concerning the budget requests of the Department of Public Instruction for state aid for county teachers' colleges.
3. The Coordinating Committee shall formulate a plan and schedule for the development and implementation of new institutions of higher education and shall report its plan to the Governor, the Legislature, and the State Building Commission.

New Program Approval

No new educational programs shall be developed or instituted at any institution of higher education, except with the Committee's approval. The Coordinating Committee for Higher Education is also charged with the responsibility for initiating new programs in those areas of need which are not being served by any one of the three systems of higher education.

Existing Programs

No educational program for which the Legislature has made a prior appropriation existing at any institution shall be abandoned, except with full legislative approval.

Guidelines for Curriculum Changes

The guidelines for curriculum changes are as follows:

1. Description of the program

(a). Nature of the objectives.

(b). Relationship of the program to the over-all academic mission of the institution involved.

(1). Specifically, what is being proposed. A new undergraduate major? A new graduate program based upon an existing undergraduate major? A program which cuts across disciplinary lines--which draws upon faculty and courses in a number of

departments? A change in the title of a degree presently awarded? An extension of an existing program?¹

2. Need

(a). Specification of need in terms of:

- (1). Contribution of the program to the advancement of human knowledge; and/or
- (2). manpower demands on local, statewide, regional and/or national basis; and/or
- (3). the internal development of the institution involved.

(b). Where appropriate (e.g., professional or specialized graduate programs), projection or estimates of the demand for graduates of the program. If quantification of manpower needs is not feasible, include relevant descriptive material on future employment trends in the field.

3. Student demand

- (a). Indications of student desire for work in the area.
- (b). Enrollment projections and statement of assumptions underlying projections.

¹Note: Depending upon the nature of the proposal, a letter of information may be sufficient, or a full statement of justification may be required where a new program is proposed--especially one having important policy and/or budgetary implications--the complete format should be followed. (CCHE #78, Working Paper, October 26, 1966, pg. 12-14.)

4. Institutional capacity as related to:

(a). Adequacy of present resources base in the program field:

faculty, library holdings, facilities, and equipment.

(b). Adequacy of resources in related or supporting fields.

(c). Proposed basis or bases for program funding:

(1). Reorganization of existing resources.

(2). Enrollment (workload) increases.

(3). Program improvement or new program funds.

(4). Extramural support from training grants, research grants, or contracts.

(d). Estimated beginning and continuing net cost of the program.

5. Interest and support on the part of administrators, faculty, and citizens.

If the staff believes that insufficient supporting materials have been submitted, additional information is requested, as needed, to render a well-considered decision.

The Wisconsin Coordinating Committee, realizing the pressing need for an updated, comprehensive, long-range plan, embodying a statement of institutional academic missions and academic program guidelines, is in the process of formulating the revision of the guidelines listed above. Therefore, these should not be considered either final or definite for the State's higher education system.

CHAPTER III

NEED FOR COORDINATION

With the rapid growth of higher education in Utah and the rest of the Nation, spawned by the expanding universe of knowledge and an increasingly competitive society, our colleges and universities must do their part by meeting the formidable challenge of providing quality education.

To accomplish this, a total coordinated effort of higher education on a statewide, regional, and even national basis must be realized. State higher education must be viewed in a broader context than can be seen by any single institution and its associated board.

In recognition of these facts, a central state coordinating agency should play a major role in the following areas:

1. New program approval.
2. New administrative unit approval.

New Administrative Unit and Program Approval

A central state coordinating agency, responsible for allocation of state higher education programs, should help achieve the following specific goals:¹

¹Oregon State System of Higher Education, Office of Academic Affairs, Functions and Organization of the Office of Academic Affairs, June 15, 1967, page 5.

1. Insure adequate availability of educational opportunities for qualified youth without unnecessary and undesirable duplication of major functions by the several institutions.
2. Improve the quality of specialized programs by centering them in designated institutions as an allocation to the institution(s) rather than allowing their development in all institutions.
3. Improve the curriculum of each institution by achieving the foregoing goals, but also by preventing unnecessary and undesirable proliferation of courses, services, and programs within each institution.

As can be deduced from the foregoing statement, a strong case exists for concentration of academic and research programs at select institutions in the state, especially at the graduate and professional levels. These programs tend to be of high cost, requiring highly specialized personnel, often expensive physical facilities, and relatively low enrollment, when compared to undergraduate programs in the same academic areas. In many instances the end result is another costly program, draining an institution of valuable resources.

A hypothetical case may assist in illustrating needless duplication. Institution A has a strong History Department, especially in Middle Eastern history. Institution B, less than 50 miles away, also has a strong History Department, specializing in American history. Institution B decides to offer a series of graduate courses in Middle Eastern history for the first time, similar to some that have been taught at Institution A for several years. Assuming the program is instituted, let us examine the outcome. The quality between these two programs will usually be at great variance. The new program at Institution B, in most instances, will not have the quality of staff, library facilities, collateral courses, etc., to be able

to offer the same quality program in Middle Eastern history as Institution A. In fact, with Institution B offering this new program, its well-recognized program in American history could very likely suffer.

If this proposal were first reviewed by a state coordinating agency with new program approval authority, what might have been the outcome? First, the agency would have seen that Institution A, within commuting distance of Institution B, already had a recognized program in Middle Eastern history, and unless some extraordinary justification could be given, the proposed program would not have been approved, conserving resources of Institution A for more profitable utilization in other areas. Secondly, the coordinating agency would probably have recommended that Institution B's program be strengthened in Middle Eastern history, if a need actually did exist for an expanded program of some kind, making maximum use of the strength of Institution B's Department of History.

The logic involved in utilizing maximum educational resources should be obvious from the above hypothetical illustration.

Limits of Authority - Course(s) Approval

A most important question arises as to the extent of the decision-making power for new course and program approval. That is, should the central coordinating agency be responsible for approval of everything down to and including the individual course or only be responsible for major programs?

As indicated in Chapter II of this report, the Wisconsin Coordinating Council's legislative charge gives it jurisdiction over the development of any higher education program in the state, but up to this point has only reviewed new majors or new schools. However, the Council feels there might be justification for program review at a lower level. The Director of the Council has stressed that:

Although the Council's legislative charge gives it jurisdiction over the development of any new higher education program in the State of Wisconsin, it has, up to this point, only reviewed new majors or new schools. The Council now is beginning to recognize that such self-imposed limitations may, in some cases, interfere with a coordinated planning function and it is now contemplating some method whereby it could, without excessive demands upon staff time, review new courses of study, new associate degree programs, or new programs at the minor level, which may have an impact upon the total State picture.¹

To help understand the previous comments, a second hypothetical illustration is developed.

An institution's Physics Department desires to initiate a single new course in meteorology. The course is approved by the proper internal administrative machinery and offered for one semester. Before the end of the semester, the Physics Department decides that one or two advanced courses are necessary because of student demand and faculty interest. Now that the institution has the beginnings of a core program in meteorology, they are desirous of developing a weather station and possibly a small research project. In short, a vicious cycle has begun -- more faculty, more research,

¹A. B. Rothwell, Executive Director of the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, Madison, Wisconsin. (November 6, 1967)

more courses, more apparatus, more library facilities. This could also result in the beginning of collateral course offerings in the Physics Department as well as in other departments such as mathematics, geology, geography, so as to provide students "necessary prerequisites and complements" to meteorology. Within a year or two the result is a Department of Meteorology without logical planning as to the state's needs and costs. In addition to this, another institution in the state already has a nationally recognized meteorology program. Once again, we see needless proliferation of courses and programs.

If the state's central coordinating agency only had authority over major program approval, they could not have prevented the initiation and creeping expansion of the program from a single course offering. Instead, they would have been confronted with a fait accompli by the time the meteorology program reached the coordinating agency for review. This is a major reason why it is recommended that the coordinating agency receive authority for new program approval down to and including the individual course level -- when a single course might lead to a whole new program, degree, or school.

Obviously, the next question is, what are the criteria for judging whether a course is part of an already-established program? The answer is, if the new course additions relate to the established roles of the institution as well as the more specific goals of the program in which they are to become a part, then the central state agency approval should be automatic. It is only when proposed new course(s) appear to deviate from these criteria that further study and analysis become necessary.

While the designated central state agency should finally be responsible for the coordinated development of programs, this in no way should relieve the institutions from responsible participation in curriculum and program development. It is acknowledged that the academic departments possess the competence to decide the proper structure and content of a program or curriculum; governing boards and administrative officers can best decide how a proposed program relates to the institutional role. It remains for the central state agency to apply its judgment as to how a proposed program relates to the programs of other institutions in the state. In addition, it must assess the prospects of growth, the impact of the change on other programs in the system, the effectiveness of the same or similar programs being offered elsewhere, and the alternative means to meet the needs established by the proposal.

Limits of Authority - New Program & Administrative Unit Approval

At higher levels of curricula approval, i.e., new programs, majors, degrees, and administrative units, consuming great quantities of human and monetary resources, the central state coordinating agency should play a major role.

Succinctly, the central agency should have the authority to allocate programs after each institution has had full opportunity to present its case. The data would be evaluated according to established guidelines¹ for new programs. These guidelines should then be applied impartially and objectively to each institution and each program request. By reviewing

¹See Part IV.

institutional proposals, the central coordinating agency could keep abreast of the changing needs of the state for new educational programs.

The assignment of roles and programs should not be considered irrevocable. Shifts in population, changes in career choices, and socio-economic changes may well provide bases for the assignment of new roles and the exchange or elimination of others. Accordingly, there should be a periodic review of roles and programs by the central state coordinating agency.¹

A discussion of the method of evaluation for the appropriate allocation of institutional responsibilities, roles, and programs, will follow. The presentation is in the form of several sets of guidelines for determining the need for a new academic program and/or administrative unit.

¹A review of existing institutional programs should be made to determine whether there is unnecessary duplication or "gaps" in the quality of on-going programs.

CHAPTER IV
CRITERIA FOR NEW PROGRAMS

Introduction

In a letter dated November 9, 1967, to the Chairman of the Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education, Governor Calvin Rampton charged that Agency with the responsibility of developing a comprehensive master plan for higher education in Utah. More specifically, he asked the Council to develop a plan that would provide for the "appropriate allocation of institution responsibility, role and program." In keeping with this challenge, an attempt has been made through this document to develop specific criteria and guidelines for the evaluation of instructional programs and/or administrative units.

Preparation of Document

Based on the derived criteria, the forms submitted would assist the central state coordinating agency in making appropriate decisions regarding the program being proposed.

In addition to completing the appropriate form(s), a further request by the agency should be that the institution complete the relevant cover sheet designed for the proposal. The signature of the president of the institution would indicate that the proposal had been reviewed by the proper institutional personnel: the department head,

the dean of the school or college, the graduate dean (if a graduate program), the academic council or senate, and the respective institutional board. The signature of the president would verify that the data contained in the proposal had been approved for release and evaluation by the central state coordinating agency. Ten copies of the proposal would then be forwarded to the office of academic affairs of the central state coordinating agency.

It should be stressed that these forms are not designed to intrude on the planning responsibilities of the separate institutions. The information required is the minimum on which the authors believe a competent decision can be based.

At the time the board of the central state coordinating agency renders a decision, the institution should be promptly advised as to the reasons for whatever action is taken. It may approve, disapprove, or require further study.

If institutions are not in concurrence with the agency's decision regarding their program request, further recourse should be provided. The institutions could submit supporting information or alterations to meet the criticisms of the agency; written appeals also could be submitted or special hearings granted.

It should be emphasized that prior to final action by the designated central state coordinating agency, no institution should publicize its intention to offer a new program.

Procedure for Program Evaluation

Two sets of guidelines are presented. One concerns new instructional programs and the other new administrative units. Each set is divided into two phases. Phase I is for planning purposes. After evaluating this phase of the proposal, the central coordinating agency should either invite the institution to submit the more detailed Phase II or inform the institution that the preliminary criteria of Phase I have not been satisfied. Approval for an institution to submit Phase II should not imply that the program has been approved. It should only indicate that the coordinating agency has assessed the program in relation to the institution's role and in terms of statewide planning for higher education. Acceptance of Phase I and Phase II should signify approval of the proposed program.

Since proposed new programs should be investigated thoroughly by the staff of the central coordinating agency prior to official action, the following time schedule is suggested:

1. If the program is to begin fall quarter, Phase I data should be submitted to the central agency by January 15th.
2. All new academic programs expected to begin winter, spring, and summer quarters, should be submitted at least 6 months before the beginning of the quarter in which the program is to be initiated.

After approval of Phase I, the institution should be informed as to the deadline for submission of Phase II materials. Under extenuating circumstances, the central coordinating agency should consider new program proposals any time during the year.

Submission of New Programs in Response to Central Agency Request

With regard to new program allocation, the central coordinating agency should have a role greater than that of a curricular clearing house. A continuous assessment of state educational and training requirements should be made. When deficiencies and/or gaps appear in on-going programs, the central agency should provide the necessary leadership to guarantee quality educational opportunities for the citizenry of the state. To accomplish the foregoing, it is suggested that:

1. The institution(s) be identified whose assigned role justifies the needed new program.
2. An invitation be extended to the selected institution(s) to submit a proposal for approval of a new program.

Criteria for Program Submission

Presented are the specific guidelines developed for new program and administrative unit approval. These criteria must be considered tentative, subject to further review and continuous evaluation.

CENTRAL STATE COORDINATING AGENCY

PROPOSAL FOR THE INITIATION OF A NEW
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Submitted by

Institution Submitting ProposalName of College, School, or DivisionName of Department(s) or Area(s)

A New Instructional Program Leading To:

Certificate, Associate, Bachelor's,
Master's, or Doctorate Degree.
(Give complete name of degree)Academic Specialty or AreaProposed Starting Date

This proposal has been
approved by the insitutional
personnel as stated in the
guidelines.

Date Received☐/Approved☐/Disapproved☐/Requires Additional StudyPresidentDate

Action by the Central State
Coordinating Agency

DirectorDate

INITIATION OF A NEW INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

PHASE IAPPROVAL FOR PLANNING PURPOSES

1. Provide a statement concerning the need for the proposed new program.
2. How does the proposed program relate to the goals, roles, and statutory purposes of the institution?
3. What effect will the proposed program have on the administrative structure of the institution? What departments, colleges, or divisions will be involved?
4. Give examples of similar programs offered elsewhere (state and region).
5. Is the program to be accredited? If so, provide the basic criteria for accreditation and explain how they will be achieved.
6. What new degrees, diplomas, and/or certificates will be offered in the new program.
7. How many students would be involved in the program the first year? Fifth year?
8. Do you have the "critical mass" of faculty necessary to initiate the program? What do you consider a "critical mass"?
9. Will adequate financial resources be available for the initiation of the new program? Cost estimates should be in terms of an on-going, high-quality program, and not a minimal, beginning program.
10. Would any new physical facilities be required? Will any modification of existing facilities be necessary?

PHASE II

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION

1. List the degrees, certificates, or diplomas to be awarded.
2. Provide a list of courses now included in the departmental curriculum which will be applied toward the new program.
3. List new courses which will be added at the time the program is initiated.
4. Provide some design as to plans for expansion of the curriculum in the first five years.
5. What courses now offered in other departments relate to this program?
6. Have outside consultants¹ reviewed your plan and schedule for the proposed new program?

ENROLLMENT

1. Explain the most likely source of students who will be expected to enroll. Will they be recruited from existing programs, or will they be attracted to the institution by the character of the program?
2. Project the enrollment for the initial year and for the next four years. Explain the basis for your projection.

¹ A thorough review of all new advanced professional and doctoral degrees should be made by a panel of distinguished individuals in the subject area under review. These experts should be secured from a variety of institutions and/or research centers. There should be mutual concurrence between the institution requesting the program and the central state coordinating agency as to the acceptability of the consultants.

COSTS

1. Estimate the initial (first year) costs. Cost estimates should be in terms of an on-going, high-quality program and not a minimal, beginning program. How much will be absorbed in current budgets, and how much additional money will be requested?
2. Estimate the annual costs for the succeeding four years. Cost estimates should be in terms of an on-going, high-quality program and not a minimal, beginning program.
3. Show current departmental operating costs for those departments involved in planning the program. Will the new program, if adopted, result in increased departmental operating costs for those departments?
4. What additional costs are anticipated beyond the teaching role of the program, i.e., research, extension?
5. What non-state funds are available from public or private sources?

FACULTY AND STAFF REQUIREMENTS

1. List the names and qualifications of faculty who will be directly involved in the program (Give name, rank, highest degree earned, and present course load).
2. Project the need for new faculty over the first five-year period. If present members of the faculty are to conduct the program, explain how they will be relieved from other duties?
3. If new faculty will be necessary, explain what qualifications will be needed and what special training will be required.
4. Describe the likely involvement of all faculty in research, extension, or other extra-curricular activity.
5. What is the present faculty-student ratio in the department(s) involved in the planning? What is conceived as a proper ratio?
6. What clerical or supporting personnel will be needed?
7. Will the program involve graduate assistants in research and teaching functions?
8. What are the prospective salary ranges of both current and proposed faculty?

FACILITIES

1. Library - are present library resources considered adequate? If not, explain how the library will need to be strengthened during the next five years. (Refer to the need for books, periodicals, primary source materials, special reference programs).
2. Laboratories - what new laboratory facilities will be needed in the first year, and what will be required during the following four years of operation?
3. Equipment - what new equipment will be needed in the first year and during the following four years?
4. Are there plans for mutual sharing of equipment between other post-high school institutions? Explain.

CENTRAL STATE COORDINATING AGENCY

PROPOSAL FOR THE INITIATION OF A NEW
ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

Submitted by

Institution Submitting ProposalName of College, School, or DivisionName of Department(s) or Area(s)Proposed Starting Date

This proposal has been
approved by the institutional
personnel as stated in the
guidelines.

PresidentDateDate Received☐/Approved☐/Disapproved☐/Requires Additional Study

Action by the Central State
Coordinating Agency

DirectorDate

NEW SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, INSTITUTES, FOUNDATIONS, RESEARCH,
PUBLIC SERVICE, AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

PHASE I

APPROVAL FOR PLANNING PURPOSES

1. Provide a short statement concerning the need and future of the proposed new administrative unit.
2. How does the proposed new administrative unit relate to the goals, roles, and statutory purposes of the institution?
3. What effect will the new administrative unit have on the overall internal structure of the institution? What departments, colleges, or divisions will be involved?
4. Is the new administrative unit to be accredited? If not, explain. When do you anticipate accreditation? If it is to be accredited, provide the anticipated time schedules.
5. List the subdivisions of the new administrative unit, i.e., if a new college, what are the departments?
6. Will adequate financial resources be available for the initiation of the new administrative unit? Cost estimates should be in terms of an on-going, high-quality program and not a minimal, beginning program.
7. Would any new physical facilities be required? Will any modification of existing facilities be necessary?

PHASE II

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION

1. List and give a brief description of the programs under the proposed new administrative unit.
2. Will any new programs be added at the time the administrative change is implemented?
3. Provide some design as to plans for expansion in the first five years.

ENROLLMENT

1. Explain the most likely source of students who will be expected to enroll. Will they be recruited from existing departments and programs, or will the proposed administrative change be expected to produce a quantitative and/or qualitative change in student population?
2. Project the enrollment for the initial year and for the next four years. Explain the basis for your projection.

FACULTY AND STAFF REQUIREMENTS

1. Project the need for additional faculty over the next five years.
2. If new faculty will be needed, explain what qualifications will be necessary.
3. What clerical or other supporting personnel will be needed?

COSTS

1. Submit a budget projection for the next five years in as much detail as possible. Include all costs, i.e., salaries, equipment, construction, etc. Cost estimates should be in terms of an on-going, high-quality program and not a minimal, beginning program.
2. How much of the proposed budget will be in the form of additional funds above current appropriations? What are the sources of funds -- state, federal, other?

In Summation

At the present time, the question of institutional governance in Utah is still unresolved. The alternatives under study are: a single board for all public higher education, or a strengthened Coordinating Council and the retention of existing boards at each institution. This appears to be an academic question when viewed in the context of program approval.

Whatever the system of governance, a central state agency should be empowered to review and allocate programs for Utah's institutions of higher education. Currently, the Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education lacks this authority, and the State is, therefore, handicapped in developing an integrated statewide educational program. Thus, Utah seems to be lagging behind a number of states in this area.

To overcome this obstacle, appropriate legislation should be enacted so that a central state agency in Utah would have authority for program allocation. This, however, is only a first step. The success of any legislation would greatly depend on the mutual cooperation of the academic community, legislators, lay citizens, and a central coordinating agency.

In addition to general cooperation, the agency responsible for program review and allocation must have a staff of high competence and professional integrity, if the agency is to gain the respect and active participation of the academic community and other concerned individuals.

APPENDIX A

SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF
ACADEMIC MASTER PLANS
CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

1. Curricular emphasis or educational objectives of the college
 - a. Undergraduate
 - b. Graduate
 - c. Specialized occupational-professional
2. Student demand
 - a. Rate of growth during the past five years
 - b. Present enrollment
 - c. Projected growth for five years
 - d. Individual enrollment and full-time equivalent
 - e. Graduate students
 - f. Present enrollment and growth potential of existing master's programs
3. General concepts of the plan
 - a. Degrees of a general nature
 - b. Specialized areas
 - c. Teacher preparation
4. Broad framework for the development of new majors
 - a. Relation to broad functions of the State colleges (Master Curriculum Plan and Title 5)
 - b. Consistency with the objectives and purposes of the college
 - c. Regional or statewide need for the program
5. College procedure for the development and approval of new programs
 - a. Origin
 - b. Revision
 - c. Approval
 - d. Faculty involvement
6. Criteria for baccalaureate and master's programs
 - a. Adequacy of present staff and projected staff
 - b. Adequacy of facilities, library, and other resources, including plans for improvement
 - c. Demonstrated need for the program in the college service region
 - d. Extent to which the proposed master's programs will enrich rather than dilute undergraduate emphasis
 - e. Maintenance of high standards for master's degree candidates

7. Cost considerations

- a. Staff
- b. Equipment
- c. Library
- d. Graduate instruction
- e. Individual proposed degrees

8. List and description of all proposed baccalaureate and master's degree programs

Table A. Projected degree programs for specified five-year period. A chart arranged by columns, showing existing degree programs and programs projected for each of the following five years.¹

Division of Academic Planning
February, 1965

¹ Note: Only this chart will eventually be presented to the Board of Trustees for action; all other materials are to be regarded as informational or supportive.

APPENDIX B

FLORIDA

PROPOSAL FOR THE INITIATION OF A NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM

Submitted by

University Submitting Proposal

Name of College or School

Name of Department(s)

A New Graduate Program Leading to the:

Masters or doctoral
(Give complete name of degree)

in

Academic Specialty or Field

Proposed starting date

-- Institutional Approval --

Department Head or Chairman Date

Graduate Dean

Date

Dean of School or College Date

President

Date

-- Interinstitutional Approval --

Date Received

Action by Council for Academic Affairs Date

Date Received

Action by Council of Presidents

Date

Title Page

The title page of the proposal should follow the format presented in the preceding page. Only three copies need to have the designated signatures.

Abstract of Proposal

An abstract of the proposal (not more than three or four pages) should be inserted between the Title Page and the body of the proposal.

Proposal

The proposal should consist of clear and concise replies to the questions which follow. Replies should follow the same sequence as the questions. Please precede each reply with the number and sub-number of the question being answered.

I. Definition of the Academic Area or Field of Specialty.

- A. What subspecialties or areas of concentration will be emphasized during the initial years of the program? (e.g., a program in economics may have faculty representing such subspecialties as econometrics, economic development, history of economic thought, income and employment theory, industrial organization and public policy, international economics, labor and industrial relations, money and banking, price and value theory, and public finance. A program in physics may include such subspecialties as accelerator design, electromagnetic theory, molecular spectra theory, nuclear physics, solid state experimental, solid state theory, ultrasonics.)
- B. Are there other subspecialties that you anticipate adding as the program develops?
- C. Do you intend to avoid certain subspecialties?
- D. What degree programs (undergraduate or graduate, majors or minors) does your institution currently offer in this field or related fields?

II. Objectives of the Program.

- A. Does the proposed program envision the training of research specialists, or the preparation of broadly educated teachers, or the training of professional practitioners, or others? How does it plan to achieve any of these objectives?

- B. How would this program help achieve the objectives of your university in terms of its role and scope within the University System?
- C. Enumerate any indirect benefits which, in your opinion, may accrue from the establishment of the program.

III. Course of Study Leading to the Proposed Degree.

- A. List the courses (by number, title, and semester hours credit) that would constitute the course requirements of the proposed program. This list should include courses from any department or schools which will be used.

It should also list research and dissertation requirements. Designate with an asterisk the courses currently offered; proposed new courses to be added do not have to have the course numbers, unless you already know what they will be when and if approved.

- B. In summary, state the number of courses required for the program, the number of courses already available, and the number of new courses to be added with the amount of credit hours for each group.
- C. Would these additional course offerings be of interest to students not majoring in this particular area of study? If so, to whom?
- D. Is the proposed program consistent with current criteria of graduate education in the discipline or profession? If not, how does the department justify its deviation from current thought about education in the field?

IV. The Strength of Supporting Areas of Scholarship and Research Facilities.

- A. Please list other departments or units in the university which would provide support to the program herein proposed (e.g., new program in chemistry must be supported by departments of mathematics and physics).
- B. Please give brief indications as to the strengths or weaknesses of each of these supporting departments, in terms of support to the proposed program.
- C. Please list any unusual research facilities available in other departments or schools which materially strengthen the proposed program.

- D. To what extent will additional staff and facilities for the proposed program help make related departments or fields of concentration stronger?

V. Justification for the Initiation of the Proposed Program.

- A. Is there a national need for more people trained in a graduate program such as is herein proposed? Please describe job opportunities nationally. Refer to any national studies on need.
- B. Is there special need in the State of Florida for graduate programs such as the one herein described? Please describe the job opportunities locally and regionally.
- C. If there is a national and local need for more people to be trained in this field, and at the level in the proposed program, are there special reasons why it should be offered at your institution rather than at one of the other institutions in the State University System?
- D. Is there interest on the part of local industry, agencies or research centers in the proposed program?
- E. Please state other justifications for the initiation of this program which may not have been included above.

VI. Similar Programs Presently Offered in Universities of the Southern Region.

- A. Are degree programs in this specialty offered at non-Florida institutions in the Southern Region?
- B. If so, what specialties, at which institutions, and at what levels?
- C. How similar or dissimilar are these to the program herein proposed?

VII. Similar Programs Presently Offered in Florida

- A. Are degree programs offered in this specialty at other institutions in the State University System of Florida? If so, which specialties, at which institutions, and at what levels? How similar or dissimilar are they to the program herein proposed?
- B. Are degree programs in this specialty offered at other institutions in Florida outside of the State University System? If so, which institutions, which specialties,

and at what levels? How similar or dissimilar are they to the program herein proposed?

VIII. Student Interest in the Proposed Program.

- A. Please provide any indication you might have about student interest in the proposed program from inside and outside of your institution. What is the basis for this opinion? What size enrollment would you anticipate during the first and second years of the program?
- B. What do you think will be the source and quality of most of the students that you expect to enroll in this program?
- C. How do you expect this program to develop in terms of student interests?
- D. What will be the course of financial support for graduate students in the proposed program? Are you aware of any special state or national programs of support for them?
- E. If the proposed program were not established, do you think the anticipated students would enroll in other universities in the System? In other institutions in Florida? If not, please explain.

IX. Financial Aid to Students.

- A. What is the total amount of money that will be needed for graduate fellowships and scholarships for each of the next three years if the program is approved? How many students would be awarded fellowships or scholarships from this amount each year and what are the anticipated sources of these funds?
- B. What is the total amount of money that will be needed for graduate assistantships for each of the next three years if the program is approved? How many students would be awarded graduate assistantships from this amount? How many would be teaching assistantships and how many would be research assistantships? What is the anticipated source of these funds?

X. Faculty.

- A. Please list the faculty currently on your staff who are concerned with this academic area or field, and for each faculty member listed, provide the following information:

1. Name of faculty person;
 2. date of birth;
 3. highest degree, year obtained, and the university from which obtained;
 4. number of doctoral students directed to the completion of the doctoral dissertation--at which institutions?;
 5. number of master's students directed to the completion of the master's thesis; at which institutions?;
 6. list not more than four specialties or subspecialties in which this faculty person feels competent to direct doctoral research;
 7. list not more than four specialties or subspecialties in which this faculty person feels competent to direct master's research;
 8. attach a list of publications which should give the names of all co-authors (if any), title of paper or book, journal, volume, number, pages (inclusive), and year;
 9. list the names of the five most important professional journals publishing papers in the area of the proposed program. In the attached lists of publications of the faculty members, check the papers which have appeared in these journals;
 10. list titles of research in progress or recently completed and name of sponsoring agency if sponsored financially;
 11. provide other information about this faculty member which may have pertinence to the proposed graduate program.
- B. Discounting, for the moment, your own institution, how many faculty members should an institution have to adequately conduct a program such as the one herein proposed and what should be their qualifications in terms of degrees and experience?
- C. In summary,
1. How many full-time equivalent faculty do you currently have with Ph.D.'s, how many with professional doctoral

degrees, how many with master's degrees, who are qualified to teach and conduct research in the proposed program?

2. How many of the faculty have directed one or more doctoral students to the final completion of their doctoral dissertation? How many have directed two or more?
 3. How many have directed one or more master's students to the final completion of a master's thesis? (Do not count master's students who did not include a thesis in their program.) How many have directed two or more?
- D. In summary form, list the academic subspecialties or areas of concentration represented by the present faculty of the unit of the university which is submitting the proposal (see examples of subspecialties in Item 1-A).
- E. Additional faculty needed:
1. Estimate the number of faculty members that would have to be added this coming academic year if this program were implemented.
 2. How many of these would be added to the broad academic area, even though this special advanced degree program were not established?
 3. How many new faculty members for this program would be anticipated for each of the next three years? Please estimate the cost.
 4. Are the additions proposed under 1 and 3 needed to add extra subspecialties to the program or to provide greater depth of the original specialties, or to accommodate more students?
 5. What additional technical or clinical personnel would be needed and at approximately what annual cost?

XI. Facilities

- A. Discounting for the moment your own institution, what facilities, such as special buildings, space, or equipment, should an institution have in order to offer a quality graduate program in this particular academic discipline and at the level herein proposed? Please list these.

1. How was this list derived and by whom? Were outside consultants involved? If so, name them.
 2. How do the facilities listed compare to those at one or more other universities offering quality programs similar to the one herein proposed? Please name one or more other universities considered in making such comparisons.
- B. Please list facilities, such as buildings, space, or equipment, which are currently available at your university for use in the program herein proposed.
- C. What additional facilities, such as special buildings, additional space, or equipment, are needed for the program herein proposed? What would be specifically needed just for the new courses that will be added to the curriculum?
- D. What is the anticipated cost of these additional facilities prior to the initiation of the program and for each of the next three years?
- E. What are the anticipated sources of funds?

XII. Library Resources.

- A. Discounting, for the moment, your own institution, what special library resources should an institution have in order to offer a quality graduate program in this particular academic discipline and at the level herein proposed? Please list these:
1. How was this list derived and by whom? Were outside consultants involved? If so, name them.
 2. How do the library resources listed compare to those at one or more other universities offering quality programs similar to the one herein proposed? Please name one or more other universities considered in making such comparisons.
- B. Please list special library resources which are currently available at your university for use in the proposed program.
- C. What additional library resources are needed for the program herein proposed? What would be specifically needed just for the new courses that will be added to the curriculum?

D. What is the anticipated cost of these additional library resources prior to the initiation of this program and for each of the next three years?

E. What are the anticipated sources of funds?

XIII. Other Needs.

Are there other needs which have not yet been described? If so, please list them; estimate their initial cost and the annual cost thereafter.

XIV. Accreditation

A. Does the program meet the requirements of appropriate accrediting associations and professional or learned societies?

B. Name the accrediting agencies and learned societies which would be concerned with the particular program herein proposed.

XV. Summary of Estimated Costs of Program.

A. Summarize the estimated costs of the program herein proposed by completing the table on the following page. Include only costs which are additional to those programs currently in operation.

B. Please list possible sources of financial support for this program, other than the State; where possible, indicate which expenditure items are eligible for this outside support and the percentage of the cost that might be obtained from this source.

XVI. Evaluation of Proposed Program.

A. Please name faculty committees or councils of your university which have reviewed and approved the program herein proposed.

B. If outside consultants have been employed, list the names of the consultants and their current positions and titles; please append hereto a copy of their report.

EXPENDITURE ITEMS	COST
-------------------	------

Estimated Additional Cost Per Year
Beginning with the Initiation of the
Proposed Program

	Proposed Program		
	Year		
	1st	2nd	3rd
	Cost	Cost	Cost
Faculty (Teachers and Researchers)			
Technical and Clinical Personnel			
Construction of New Space or Major Renovation			
Equipment			
Library Resources			
Fellowships and Scholarships			
Graduate Assistantships			
Materials and Supplies			
Other Items (please list)			
<u>Total</u>			
Percentage of Total Anticipated From State Appropriations			

APPENDIX C

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD
223 1/2 East Washington Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Revised 5/8/67

REQUEST FOR INITIAL DISCUSSION REGARDING A NEW CURRICULUM

Institution District No. Date

Mailing Address

- I. What is the area or title of proposed curriculum? _____
- II. Is this curriculum intended to be: Baccalaureate Oriented _____
Occupational Oriented _____ Adult Oriented _____ General Ed. _____
(Neither Baccalaureate or Occupational Oriented for Gen. Ed.)
- III. What are the reasons which appear to make the development of this curriculum at your college seem desirable?
- IV. Who will have direct administrative responsibility for planning this curriculum?

Name Title

- V. What is your anticipated timetable for developing and initiating this curriculum?

Activity	Month	Time	Year
a. Submission of application for priority to develop this curriculum.	_____	_____	_____
b. Submission of application for approval of this curriculum.	_____	_____	_____
c. Initiation of classes	_____	_____	_____

Date _____ Signed _____
President of College

NOTE: Please submit one copy to the Illinois Junior College Board.

FORM A

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD BOARD OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND REHAB.
 223 1/2 East Washington Street Vocational and Technical Education Div.
 Springfield, Illinois 62706 405 Centennial Bldg., Springfield, Ill.

APPLICATION FOR PRIORITY TO DEVELOP
 A NEW OCCUPATIONAL-ORIENTED CURRICULUM

 Institution Dist. No. Date

 Mailing Address

I. Type and scope of program:

- a. Code number and title of proposed curriculum (as shown on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Education; Instructional Codes and Titles).

Code Number _____ Title _____

- b. For what jobs is the curriculum preparatory?

- c. What is the anticipated length of the curriculum?

_____ for full-time students
 Number Semesters or Quarters

_____ for part-time students
 Number Semesters or Quarters

- d. What degree or certificate is anticipated to be given upon completion of the curriculum? _____

- e. What admission requirements are anticipated for the students entering the curriculum?

II. Need:

- a. What are the employment possibilities for graduates?

Local: _____ per year for the next ____ years.

Regional: _____ per year for the next ____ years.

NOTE: Please submit one copy to the Illinois Junior College Board.

II. Need: (continued)

- b. What is present prevailing rate of pay for persons employed in jobs for which this curriculum is preparatory?

\$_____ (check one--per hour_____ per week_____ per month_____)

- c. If this curriculum is planned for full-time students 18-20 years of age, what is the projected rate of pay for persons upon completion of this curriculum and who are 19-21 years of age?

\$_____ (check one--per hour_____ per week_____ per month_____)

- d. Give a brief description of the procedures used to determine the employment needs and attach six copies of questionnaires, other instruments, and reports.

- e. What are the estimated student enrollments in the program?

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>
First Year:	_____	_____
Third Year:	_____	_____
Sixth Year:	_____	_____

- f. Give a brief description of the procedures used to determine the potential enrollments and attach six copies of questionnaires, other instruments, and reports.

III. Institutional Resources:

- a. How many additional staff members will be required to implement this program?

First Year: _____

Third Year: _____

Sixth Year: _____

- b. Identify the anticipated sources of personnel.
- c. Is your salary structure adequate to recruit teaching personnel for this program?

NOTE: The term "coordinator" as used in terms "d" through "g" below means a person who is directly involved in the instructional process and who possesses special competence in the curricular area. The term is not intended to indicate an administrative title.

- d. Is the prospective coordinator of the proposed curriculum presently employed on your staff?
- e. If the answer to "d" is yes, please give the individual's name. _____
- f. If the answer to "d" is no, do you intend to employ a coordinator prior to development of the curriculum?
- g. If the answer to "f" is yes, how long do you expect the coordinator to be on your campus prior to the initiation of classes?
- h. What additional physical facilities are needed for the program?
- Classroom space _____
- Laboratory space _____
- i. How do you expect to acquire these additional physical facilities?

IV. Financing:

- a. What are the estimated costs of this program?

	Costs	
	<u>For Personnel</u>	<u>For Equipment</u>
Prior to the first year of operation	\$ _____	\$ _____
For the first year of operation	\$ _____	\$ _____
For the third year of operation	\$ _____	\$ _____

Costs

	<u>For Personnel</u>	<u>For Equipment</u>
--	----------------------	----------------------

For the sixth year of operation	\$ _____	\$ _____
---------------------------------	----------	----------

<u>Prior to and During First Year of Opera- tion</u>	<u>Second Through Sixth Year of Operation</u>
--	---

b. How do you plan to finance this program?

Local Tax	\$ _____	\$ _____
Business or Industry	\$ _____	\$ _____
State Funds through the Illinois Junior College Board	\$ _____	\$ _____
State and/or Federal Funds Through the Board of Voca- tional Education and Rehabi- litation	\$ _____	\$ _____
Tuition	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other (Specify)	\$ _____	\$ _____

I understand that the consideration to grant or deny priority will be based upon both local and statewide assessments of need for such a curriculum. If the priority is granted, the college is in a position to make competent staff available to work with representatives from business and industry in the development of the curriculum.

Date _____ Signed _____
President of College

* * * * *

Priority to develop this curriculum is _____ by the
(Granted or denied)

Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education.

The granting of priority assures the college that consideration will be given this curriculum provided the curriculum is developed, approved and offered to students not later than _____.

Date _____ Signed _____

Executive Secretary
Illinois Junior College Board

* * * * *

Financial support of an approved coordinator for curriculum development is authorized for a maximum of _____.

(No.) (Semesters, quarters or months)

Applications for approval of the coordinator, financial support, and/or financial reimbursement are to be made to the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, Vocational and Technical Education Division.

Chief, Occupational Area_____
Date_____
Coordinator, Program Implementation and
Supervision Unit_____
Date

APPENDIX D

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

REGISTRATION OF GENERAL PROGRAMS CHECKLIST

As you know, a registration visit by the Division of Higher Education to your institution is scheduled. That current information may be studied beforehand, please send data checked ☐ S . Please have ready for review, on campus during the visit, the material checked ☐ A . Where your catalog or other publication makes a complete and accurate statement, please feel free not to answer in further detail.

A. Enrollment:

a) TOTAL ENROLLMENT _____

b) Enrollment in curricula:

According to our files, here are the academic concentrations in which you currently offer majors and the degrees to which the programs lead. Will you please check this list and make any necessary corrections. In the space preceding each curriculum, please write the number of students majoring in that curriculum.

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

B. Resources:

1. _____ Balance sheet (charter of accounts) prepared by C.P.A.
2. _____ Operating and capital budgets for current academic year.
3. _____ Projected operating and capital budgets for 19__ to 19__.

C. Library:

1. _____ Number of different volumes and their distribution by Dewey Decimal or Library of Congress classifications.
2. _____ List of periodicals received and the years covered for each.
3. _____ List of newspapers received.
4. _____ Number of books awaiting processing.
5. _____ Number of seating spaces available to students.
6. _____ Percentage of library budget expended on books and percentage spent on salaries.
7. _____ Percentage of total college budget expended on library.
8. _____ Committee meeting minutes.
9. _____ Library staff: Full-time Professionals _____;
Full-time Non-Professionals _____.

D. Faculty:

1. _____ Vitae of individual faculty members, as per form attached.
2. _____ (a) Salary scale _____; (b) fringe benefits _____.
3. _____ Administration's policy on (a) appointment _____, (b) leaves _____, (c) promotion _____, (d) tenure _____, (e) advanced study _____.
4. _____ Faculty turnover for past _____ years.
5. _____ Committee meeting minutes.

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTDIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224FACULTY DATA SHEET

NAME _____

Check one: FULL-TIME: _____ PART-TIME: _____

INSTRUCTIONAL RANK _____

DEPARTMENT OR DIVISION _____

BACHELOR'S DEGREE: Title _____ Date _____

Institution _____

Major Field _____

MASTER'S DEGREE: Title _____ Date _____

Institution _____

Major Field _____

DOCTOR'S DEGREE: Title _____ Date _____

Institution _____

Major Field _____

OTHER DEGREE(S) OR CERTIFICATE(S):

Title _____ Date _____

Institution _____

Major Field _____

DEGREE WORK IN PROGRESS:

Degree Sought _____

Institution _____

Major Field _____

Semester Hrs. Completed _____

TEACHING EXPERIENCE: (Years at each level, including current position)

Higher Education _____ Secondary _____ Elementary _____

COLLEGES WHERE INSTRUCTOR HAS TAUGHT: _____

COURSES TAUGHT ON CAMPUS DURING THE CURRENT SEMESTER (OR QUARTER)

Title	Lecture Hours	Laboratory Hours	Student Enrollment In Each Section of Each Course

COURSES TAUGHT ON CAMPUS DURING PREVIOUS SEMESTER

TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES OFF CAMPUS (Extension classes, other institutions, etc.)

(A) NON-TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES ON CAMPUS

(B) NON-TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES OFF CAMPUS (e.g., private law practice, business, consulting, etc.)

LIST HONORS AND PUBLICATIONS ON REVERSE SIDE.